arXiv:1606.08616v1 [math.NT] 28 Jun 2016

EXPLICIT SHORT INTERVALS FOR PRIMES IN ARITHMETIC PROGRESSIONS ON GRH

ADRIAN W. DUDEK, LOÏC GRENIÉ, AND GIUSEPPE MOLTENI

Abstract. We prove explicit versions of Cramér's theorem for primes in arithmetic progressions, on the assumption of the generalised Riemann hypothesis.

1. Motivations and results

The purpose of this article is to combine techniques from analytic number theory with computation to furnish explicit short interval results for primes in arithmetic progressions. This is done on the assumption of the generalised Riemann hypothesis (GRH), and builds on the earlier work of the authors [1], where the problem was considered without reference to residue classes.

Throughout this paper, unless it is mentioned, we will be assuming GRH to be true. Let $q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $(a,q)=1$. Unconditionally, both McCurley [8] and later Kadiri [6] proved that, for every positive ϵ and q_0, there exists $\alpha = \alpha(\epsilon, q_0)$ such that if $\log x \geq \alpha_\epsilon \log^2 q$ and $q \geq q_0$, then $[x, e^\epsilon x]$ contains a prime p congruent to a modulo q. They provide pairs of explicit values for α and q_0 dependent on the choice of ϵ; Kadiri's work improves on that of McCurley by providing smaller values of α.

Clearly, on the assumption of GRH, the result should improve significantly; Dusart proved in his Ph.D. Thesis [2, Th. 3.7, p. 114] that when $x \geq \max(\exp(\frac{5}{4}q), 10^{10})$ one has

$$\left|\psi(x;q,a) - \frac{x}{\varphi(q)}\right| \leq \frac{1}{4\pi}\sqrt{x}\log^2 x.$$

This implies that there is a prime in $[x-h, x+h]$ which is congruent to a modulo q provided that $h > (\frac{1}{4\pi}+\epsilon)\varphi(q)\sqrt{x}\log^2 x$ and $x \geq x_0(q,\epsilon)$ for every $\epsilon > 0$.
Recently, in joint work with the second and third authors, Perelli [5, Th. 1] proved that there exist absolute (i.e., independent of x and q) positive constants x_0, c_1 and c_2 such that for $x \geq x_0$ and $c_1\varphi(q)\sqrt{x}\log x \leq h \leq x$ one has

$$\pi(x+h;q,a) - \pi(x;q,a) \geq c_2 \frac{h}{\varphi(q)\log x}. \tag{1.1}$$

This is in some sense the best result we can hope to prove, but the constants are not explicit.
In the present paper we prove the following result.

Theorem 1.1. *Assume GRH, $q \geq 3$ and $(a,q)=1$. Let α, δ, ρ, m and m' be as in Table 1 and assume that*

$$h \geq \varphi(q)(\alpha \log x + \delta \log q + \rho)\sqrt{x}.$$

Then it follows that if $x \geq (m\varphi(q)\log q)^2$ then there is a prime p which is congruent to a modulo q with $|p-x| < h$. Furthermore, if we assume that

$$h \geq \varphi(q)((\alpha+1)\log x + \delta \log q + \rho)\sqrt{x}$$

and $x \geq (m'\varphi(q)\log q)^2$, then there are at least $\sqrt{x}$ such primes.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 11N13, Secondary 11N05.
Key words and phrases. Primes in progressions, Cramér's theorem, GRH.

TABLE 1. Parameters for Theorem 1.1

α	δ	ρ	m	m'	α	δ	ρ	m	m'
1/2	1	30	70	130	1.253/2	0.1	10	1000	1800
1/2	1/2	20	180	376	1	0	20	66	131
1/2	1/3	10	2000	3700	0.9	0	10	100	174
1.253/2	1	30	60	110	0.8	0	10	130	270
1.253/2	1/2	15	100	188	0.7	0	5	400	830
1.253/2	0.2	10	220	503					

The claim of this theorem has the same qualitative behavior in its dependencies on q as what is predicted in (1.1), but the constants m and m' ruling the minimum x are quite large. This is the effect of the fact that under the hypotheses for the theorem the quotient h/x is for sure small in the long run for x, but this happens uniformly in q only for very large values of q. In fact, when x has its lowest value we have

$$\frac{h}{x_{\min}} = \frac{\varphi(q)(\alpha \log x_{\min} + \delta \log q + \rho)}{\sqrt{x_{\min}}} = \frac{2\alpha+\delta+o(1)}{m+o(1)}.$$

This considerably affects the computations, simply because they are more effective for smaller h/x, and so we are forced to choose larger values of m and m'. This also means that for small q and some limited range of x, extensive numerical tests have to be performed to complete the proof.

From the same general formulas we also deduce the following result.

Theorem 1.2. *Assume GRH and let $q \geq 3$ and $(a,q) = 1$. Let*

$$h \geq \varphi(q)\Big(\frac{1}{2}\log(q^2 x)+100\Big)\sqrt{x}.$$

Then it follows that if $x \geq (15\varphi(q)\log q \log\log q)^2$ then there is a prime p which is congruent to a modulo q with $|p-x| < h$. Furthermore, if we assume that

$$h \geq \varphi(q)\Big(\frac{1}{2}\log(q^2 x^3)+100\Big)\sqrt{x}$$

and $x \geq (19\varphi(q)\log q \log\log q)^2$, then there are at least $\sqrt{x}$ such primes.

Theorem 1.2 is worse in its dependency of the minimum x on q, but the constants are better. As a consequence, its claim improves on the case $\alpha = 1/2$, $\delta = 1$ in Theorem 1.1 for all $q \leq \exp(\exp(70/15)) \approx 10^{46}$.

Both theorems could be adapted to include the cases $q = 1$ and $q = 2$, but for them we have already proved a better result in [1] where the conclusions are proved with $h = \frac{1}{2}\log x + 2$ for any $x \geq 2$.

The conclusions improve significantly if, following Dusart, we select a lower bound for x of exponential type in terms of q. In fact, the same formulas producing Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 allow us to prove the following result.

Theorem 1.3. *Assume GRH, $(a,q) = 1$ and $x \geq \exp(q)$. Let*

$$h \geq \frac{\varphi(q)}{2}\log(q^2 x)\sqrt{x}.$$

Then for each $q \geq 35$ there is a prime p which is congruent to a modulo q with $|p-x| < h$. Furthermore, assuming that

$$h \geq \frac{\varphi(q)}{2}\log(q^2 x^3)\sqrt{x}$$

and $q \geq 67$, there are at least $\sqrt{x}$ such primes.

This claim is always stronger than what we deduce from Dusart's result, apart from the larger minimum value for q.

Note that Theorem 1.1 (case $\alpha = 1/2$, $\delta = 1$) shows that the least prime congruent to a modulo q is lower than

$$(71^2+o(1))(\varphi(q)\log q)^2$$

where $o(1)$ is explicit. According to computations in Section 5 (see Table 3), the constant reduces to $49^2+2\cdot 49$ for extremely large values of q but this is notably weaker than the bound $(\varphi(q)\log q)^2$ which has been proved by Lamzouri, Li and Soundararajan [7, Cor. 1.2] for all q.

Also, from Theorem 1.1, one deduces the following explicit version of a quasi-Dirichlet's conjecture for primes close to squares of integers.

Corollary 1.4. *Assume GRH and let $q \geq 1$ and $n \geq 70\varphi(q)\log q$. Then the interval*

$$\big(n^2, (n+\varphi(q)(30+2\log(qn)))^2\big)$$

contains a prime which is congruent to a modulo q, for every a coprime to q.

Similar corollaries may be deduced from Theorems 1.2 and 1.3.

2. Functional equation and integral representation

Let χ be a character modulo q; let χ^* be the primitive character inducing χ and let q_χ be its conductor. Let $a_\chi := (1-\chi(-1))/2$ denote the parity of χ, so that

$$L(s,\chi) = L(s,\chi^*)\prod_{p\mid q}\big(1-\chi^*(p)p^{-s}\big)$$

and

$$\xi(1-s,\chi^*) = \frac{\tau(\chi^*)}{i^{a_\chi}\sqrt{q_\chi}}\xi(s,\overline{\chi^*})$$

where we have that

$$\xi(s,\chi^*) := s(s-1)\Big(\frac{q_\chi}{\pi}\Big)^{\frac{s+a_\chi}{2}}\Gamma\Big(\frac{s+a_\chi}{2}\Big)L(s,\chi^*).$$

We also let

$$\psi_\chi^{(1)}(x) := \int_0^x \psi_\chi(u)\,\mathrm{d}u = \sum_{n\leq x}\chi(n)\Lambda(n)(x-n) \tag{2.1}$$

and recall the integral representation

$$\psi_\chi^{(1)}(x) = -\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{2-i\infty}^{2+i\infty}\frac{L'}{L}(s,\chi)\frac{x^{s+1}}{s(s+1)}\,\mathrm{d}s \tag{2.2}$$

which holds for all $x \geq 1$. The next lemma gives an alternative representation for $\psi_{\chi^*}^{(1)}(x)$ based on the representation (2.2) applied to the character χ^*.

Lemma 2.1. *We have that*

$$\psi_{\chi^*}^{(1)}(x) = \frac{x^2}{2}\delta_{\chi^*=\mathbf{1}} - \sum_{\rho\in Z_{\chi^*}}\frac{x^{\rho+1}}{\rho(\rho+1)} - xr_{\chi^*} + r'_{\chi^*} + R_{\chi^*}^{(1)}(x) \tag{2.3}$$

where Z_{χ^*} is the set of nontrivial zeros of $L(s,\chi^*)$, and r_{χ^*}, r'_{χ^*} are the constants

$$r_{\chi^*} = \frac{L'}{L}(0,\chi^*)(a_\chi\delta_{\chi^*\neq\mathbf{1}}+\delta_{\chi^*=\mathbf{1}}) - (1+\beta)(1-a_\chi)\delta_{\chi^*\neq\mathbf{1}},$$
$$r'_{\chi^*} = (1-\alpha)a_\chi + \frac{L'}{L}(-1,\chi^*)(1-a_\chi),$$

with α and $\beta \in \mathbb{C}$ defined in the proof,

$$R_{\chi^*}^{(1)}(x) = -\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{x^{1-2n-a_\chi}}{(2n+a_\chi)(2n+a_\chi-1)} + a_\chi\log x - (1-a_\chi)\delta_{\chi^*\neq\mathbf{1}}\,x\log x,$$

$\delta_{\chi^*=\mathbf{1}}$ *is* 1 *when* $\chi^* = \mathbf{1}$ *and* 0 *otherwise, and* $\delta_{\chi^*\neq\mathbf{1}} = 1-\delta_{\chi^*=\mathbf{1}}$.

Proof. The poles of $-\frac{L'}{L}(s,\chi)\frac{x^{s+1}}{s(s+1)}$ at the trivial zeros $s = -2n-a_\chi$ are simple for every integer $n \geq 1$. Moreover, when $a_\chi = 1$, the pole at $s = 0$ is simple and its contribution to $R^{(1)}_{\chi^*}(x)$ is $-\frac{L'}{L}(0,\chi^*)x$, while the one in $s = -a_\chi = -1$ (i.e. $n = 0$) is a double pole with contribution

$$1-\alpha+\log x,$$

where $-\frac{L'}{L}(-1+\epsilon,\chi^*) =: -\frac{1}{\epsilon}+\alpha+O(\epsilon)$.
Lastly, when $a_\chi = 0$, the pole at $s = -1$ is simple and its contribution to $R^{(1)}_{\chi^*}(x)$ is $\frac{L'}{L}(-1,\chi^*)$, while the one in $s = -a_\chi = 0$ (i.e. $n = 0$) is double and its contribution is

$$x(1+\beta-\log x),$$

where $-\frac{L'}{L}(\epsilon,\chi^*) =: -\frac{1}{\epsilon}+\beta+O(\epsilon)$ when χ^* is not trivial, and is simple with contribution equal to $-\frac{L'}{L}(0,\chi^*)x$ when χ^* is trivial. □

3. General setting and partial results

Let $q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $(a,q) = 1$. For any sequence $f = \{f_\chi\}$ of objects depending on the character χ modulo q let

$$M_{a,q}f_\chi := \frac{1}{\varphi(q)}\sum_{\chi\in(\mathbb{Z}/q\mathbb{Z})^*}\overline{\chi}(a)f_\chi.$$

The operator $M_{a,q}$ selects for the integers which are congruent to a modulo q. Notice that $M_{a,q}$ is akin to the mean value, since if $|f_\chi| \in [m,M]$ for every character, then $|M_{a,q}f_\chi| \in [m,M]$. Moreover, for any function $f\colon \mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{C}$ we let

$$\Delta_{2,h}f := f(x+h)-2f(x)+f(x-h).$$

The operator $\Delta_{2,h}$ will select the integers which are in the interval $(x-h,x+h)$.
Notably, the operators $M_{a,q}$ and $\Delta_{2,h}$ commute and

$$M_{a,q}\Delta_{2,h}\psi^{(1)}_\chi(x) = \sum_{n=a\,[q]}\Lambda(n)K(x-n;h)$$

where $K(u;h) := \max\{h-|u|,0\}$, so that it is supported in $|u| \leq h$, is positive in the open set, and has a unique maximum at $u = 0$ with $K(0;h) = h$. The theorem follows from this basic equality by estimating, in the standard way, the function appearing on the left hand side. Since Lemma 2.1 is valid only for χ^*, we firstly need to connect $\psi^{(1)}_\chi$ with $\psi^{(1)}_{\chi^*}$. To this end, we let

$$B(\chi,x) := \psi^{(1)}_\chi(x)-\psi^{(1)}_{\chi^*}(x).$$

and prove the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *Assume* $x \geq 1$ *and* $0 < h \leq x$. *Then*

$$|M_{a,q}\Delta_{2,h}B(\chi,x)| \leq \omega(q)h\log(2x).$$

Proof. We will prove that

$$|\Delta_{2,h}B(\chi,x)| \leq \omega(q)h\log(2x), \tag{3.1}$$

and the claim will immediately follow by the mean value property of $M_{a,q}$. By (2.1) we have that

$$B(\chi,x) = \sum_{n\leq x}(\chi(n)-\chi^*(n))\Lambda(n)(x-n).$$

Thus, only those integers that are coprime to q_χ and not q will be counted, giving

$$B(\chi,x) = -\sum_{\substack{n\leq x\\(n,q)>1\\(n,q_\chi)=1}}\chi^*(n)\Lambda(n)(x-n).$$

It follows that

$$\Delta_{2,h}B(\chi,x) = -\sum_{\substack{(n,q)>1\\(n,q_\chi)=1}} \chi^*(n)\Lambda(n)K(x-n;h),$$

and therefore

$$|\Delta_{2,h}B(\chi,x)| \le \sum_{\substack{(n,q)>1\\(n,q_\chi)=1}} \Lambda(n)K(x-n;h).$$

Recalling the definition of Λ and removing the restriction $(n,q_\chi)=1$, we get

$$|\Delta_{2,h}B(\chi,x)| \le \sum_{p|q}\log p\sum_{k\ge1} K(x-p^k;h). \tag{3.2}$$

The inner sum is trivially bounded by

$$h\sum_{\substack{p^k<x+h\\1\le k}} 1 \le h\left\lfloor\frac{\log(x+h)}{\log p}\right\rfloor.$$

Finally, (3.2) gives

$$|\Delta_{2,h}B(\chi,x)| \le h\sum_{p|q}\log(x+h) = \omega(q)h\log(x+h)$$

which is (3.1) under the restriction $0<h\le x$. □

Lemma 3.2. *Assume $x\ge100$ and $0<h\le\frac56x$. Then*

$$M_{a,q}\Delta_{2,h}\psi^{(1)}_{\chi^*}(x) = \frac{h^2}{\varphi(q)} + \theta\Big[\Big|M_{a,q}\Delta_{2,h}\sum_{\rho\in Z_{\chi^*}}\frac{x^{\rho+1}}{\rho(\rho+1)}\Big| + 1.7\Big|\delta_{\pm1[q]}(a)-\frac{2}{\varphi(q)}\Big|\frac{h^2}{x} + \delta_{\pm1[q]}(a)\frac{6h^2}{x(x-1)}\Big]$$

for some $\theta=\theta(a,q,x,h)\in[-1,1]$, where $\delta_{\pm1[q]}(a)=1$ when $a=\pm1 \pmod q$ and 0 otherwise.

The value $\frac56$ in the upper bound $h\le\frac56x$ could be changed in a quite large interval without affecting the final result. However, in order to bound the secondary terms as h^2/x and h^2/x^2 respectively, it is essential to have an upper bound for h/x strictly smaller than 1.

Proof. We apply the operator $M_{a,q}\Delta_{2,h}$ to (2.3). We notice that $\Delta_{2,h}x^j=0$ for $j=0$, 1, and in general

$$\Delta_{2,h}f(x) = \int_0^h (h-u)(f''(x+u)+f''(x-u))\,\mathrm{d}u$$

for every C^2 function. Thus

$$M_{a,q}\Delta_{2,h}\Big(\frac{x^2}{2}\delta_{\chi^*=\mathbf1}\Big) = M_{a,q}(\delta_{\chi^*=\mathbf1})\cdot\Delta_{2,h}\Big(\frac{x^2}{2}\Big) = \frac{h^2}{\varphi(q)}, \tag{3.3}$$

$$M_{a,q}\Delta_{2,h}(-xr_{\chi^*}+r'_{\chi^*}) = 0, \tag{3.4}$$

and we have still to bound $M_{a,q}\Delta_{2,h}R^{(1)}_{\chi^*}(x)$. This is the sum of three terms:

$$M_{a,q}\Delta_{2,h}\big(a_\chi\log x\big),\qquad M_{a,q}\Delta_{2,h}\big((1-a_\chi)\delta_{\chi^*\ne\mathbf1}\,x\log x\big),$$
$$M_{a,q}\Delta_{2,h}\Big(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{x^{1-2n-a_\chi}}{(2n+a_\chi)(2n+a_\chi-1)}\Big).$$

Since the set of even characters is a subgroup of $(\mathbb{Z}/q\mathbb{Z})^*$ of index two, we have

$$M_{a,q}(1-a_\chi) = \frac{1}{\varphi(q)}\sum_{\substack{\chi\in(\mathbb{Z}/q\mathbb{Z})^*\\ \chi\,\text{even}}}\overline{\chi(a)} = \frac12\delta_{\pm1[q]}(a),$$

$$M_{a,q}((1-a_\chi)\delta_{\chi^*\neq\mathbf{1}}) = \frac{1}{\varphi(q)}\Big(\sum_{\substack{\chi\in(\mathbb{Z}/q\mathbb{Z})^*\\ \chi\,\mathrm{even}}}\overline{\chi(a)}-1\Big) = \frac{1}{2}\delta_{\pm1[q]}(a)-\frac{1}{\varphi(q)},$$

$$M_{a,q}(a_\chi) = \frac{1}{\varphi(q)}\sum_{\substack{\chi\in(\mathbb{Z}/q\mathbb{Z})^*\\ \chi\,\mathrm{odd}}}\overline{\chi(a)} = \frac{1}{2}\delta_{\pm1[q]}(a)\eta(a),$$

where η is any odd character modulo q. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}|\Delta_{2,h}\log x| &= \int_0^h (h-u)\Big(\frac{1}{(x+u)^2}+\frac{1}{(x-u)^2}\Big)\,\mathrm{d}u = \int_0^h \frac{2(h-u)(x^2+u^2)}{(x^2-u^2)^2}\,\mathrm{d}u\\ &\le \frac{2}{(x^2-h^2)^2}\int_0^h (h-u)(x^2+u^2)\,\mathrm{d}u = \frac{h^2(x^2+\frac{h^2}{6})}{(x^2-h^2)^2} \le 12\frac{h^2}{x^2},\end{aligned}$$

where for the last inequality we have used the assumption $0<h\le 5x/6$. Thus we have that

$$|M_{a,q}\Delta_{2,h}\big(a_\chi\log x\big)| \le 6\frac{h^2}{x^2}\delta_{\pm1[q]}(a). \tag{3.5}$$

Similarly, for $0\le h\le 5x/6$ it follows that

$$|\Delta_{2,h}x\log x| \le \frac{xh^2}{x^2-h^2} \le 3.4\frac{h^2}{x},$$

and so

$$|M_{a,q}\Delta_{2,h}\big((1-a_\chi)\delta_{\chi^*\neq\mathbf{1}}\,x\log x\big)| \le 1.7\Big|\delta_{\pm1[q]}(a)-\frac{2}{\varphi(q)}\Big|\frac{h^2}{x}. \tag{3.6}$$

Lastly,

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_{2,h}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{x^{1-2n-a_\chi}}{(2n+a_\chi)(2n+a_\chi-1)} &= \int_0^h (h-u)\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\Big((x+u)^{-1-2n-a_\chi}+(x-u)^{-1-2n-a_\chi}\Big)\,\mathrm{d}u\\ &= \int_0^h (h-u)\Big(\frac{(x+u)^{-1-a_\chi}}{(x+u)^2-1}+\frac{(x-u)^{-1-a_\chi}}{(x-u)^2-1}\Big)\,\mathrm{d}u.\end{aligned}$$

Using $h\le 5x/6$ (and taking $u=vh$ with the fact that the function increases in h), we have that the above expression is bounded above by

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{h^2}{x^{3+a_\chi}}\int_0^1 (1-v)\Big(\frac{(1+5v/6)^{-1-a_\chi}}{(1+5v/6)^2-x^{-2}}+\frac{(1-5v/6)^{-1-a_\chi}}{(1-5v/6)^2-x^{-2}}\Big)\,\mathrm{d}v\\ &= \frac{6h^2}{5x^{3+a_\chi}}\int_0^{5/6}\Big(1-\frac{6}{5}w\Big)\Big(\frac{(1+w)^{-1-a_\chi}}{(1+w)^2-x^{-2}}+\frac{(1-w)^{-1-a_\chi}}{(1-w)^2-x^{-2}}\Big)\,\mathrm{d}w.\end{aligned}$$

Since $x\ge 100$, this is bounded above by

$$\frac{6h^2}{5x^{3+a_\chi}}\int_0^{5/6}\Big(1-\frac{6}{5}w\Big)\Big(\frac{(1+w)^{-1-a_\chi}}{(1+w)^2-100^{-2}}+\frac{(1-w)^{-1-a_\chi}}{(1-w)^2-100^{-2}}\Big)\,\mathrm{d}w \le 12\frac{h^2}{x^{3+a_\chi}}.$$

Thus, we have that

$$\Big|M_{a,q}\Delta_{2,h}\Big(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{x^{1-2n-a_\chi}}{(2n+a_\chi)(2n+a_\chi-1)}\Big)\Big| \le 6\frac{h^2}{x^3}\Big(1+\frac{1}{x}\Big)\delta_{\pm1[q]}(a), \tag{3.7}$$

and now the claim follows from (2.3) and (3.3–3.7). □

We split the sum on zeros as

$$\sum_{\rho\in Z_{\chi^*}}\frac{x^{\rho+1}}{\rho(\rho+1)} =: \Sigma_{\chi^*,1}+\Sigma_{\chi^*,2},$$

with $\Sigma_{\chi^*,1}$ and $\Sigma_{\chi^*,2}$ representing the sums on zeros with $|\mathrm{Im}(\rho)|\le T$ and $|\mathrm{Im}(\rho)|>T$, respectively, for a convenient parameter $T>0$. The next lemma provides a bound for $\Sigma_{\chi^*,2}$.

Lemma 3.3. *Assume GRH, $q \geq 3$ and $T \geq 16$. Then*

$$\left|M_{a,q}\Delta_{2,h}\Sigma_{\chi^*,2}\right| \leq \frac{4}{\pi}\Big(x^{3/2}+\frac{h^2}{4\sqrt{x}}\Big)\Big(1+\frac{2.89}{T}\Big)\frac{\log(qT)}{T}.$$

Proof. For $0 \leq h \leq x$, one has $(x+h)^{3/2}+2x^{3/2}+(x-h)^{3/2} \leq 4x^{3/2}+h^2/\sqrt{x}$. Thus, GRH gives us that

$$\left|\Delta_{2,h}\Sigma_{\chi^*,2}\right| \leq 4\Big(x^{3/2}+\frac{h^2}{4\sqrt{x}}\Big) \sum_{\substack{\rho\in Z_{\chi^*}\\ |\mathrm{Im}(\rho)|>T}} \frac{1}{|\rho(\rho+1)|},$$

so that

$$\left|M_{a,q}\Delta_{2,h}\Sigma_{\chi^*,2}\right| \leq \frac{4}{\varphi(q)}\Big(x^{3/2}+\frac{h^2}{4\sqrt{x}}\Big) \sum_{\chi\in(\mathbb{Z}/q\mathbb{Z})^*} \sum_{\substack{\rho\in Z_{\chi^*}\\ |\mathrm{Im}(\rho)|>T}} \frac{1}{|\rho(\rho+1)|}.$$

Each inner sum on zeros could be estimated by partial summation using the known formulas for the number of zeros of each $L(s,\chi)$ (see Trudgian [13]), but we can reduce the error term by connecting the sum with a similar sum for a Dedekind zeta function. In fact one has the factorization $\zeta_{\mathbb{Q}[q]}(s) = \prod_{\chi\in(\mathbb{Z}/q\mathbb{Z})^*} L(s,\chi^*)$, where $\mathbb{Q}[q]$ is the cyclotomic field of q-roots of unity (see [14, Th. 4.3]), and thus

$$\left|M_{a,q}\Delta_{2,h}\Sigma_{\chi^*,2}\right| \leq \frac{4}{\varphi(q)}\Big(x^{3/2}+\frac{h^2}{4\sqrt{x}}\Big) \sum_{\substack{\rho\in Z_{q}\\ |\mathrm{Im}(\rho)|>T}} \frac{1}{|\rho(\rho+1)|}, \tag{3.8}$$

where Z_q is the multiset of zeros of $\zeta_{\mathbb{Q}[q]}$. This sum has already been estimated in [4, Eq. (3.7)] for a generic number field $\mathbb{K}$, the result being that

$$\sum_{|\gamma|\geq T} \frac{\pi}{|\rho|^2} \leq \Big(1+\frac{2.89}{T}\Big)\frac{W_{\mathbb{K}}(T)}{T}+\Big(1+\frac{18.61}{T}\Big)\frac{n_{\mathbb{K}}}{T}+\frac{17.31}{T^2}$$

for all $T \geq 5$ where $W_{\mathbb{K}}(T) := \log\Delta_{\mathbb{K}}+n_{\mathbb{K}}\log(T/2\pi)$, $\Delta_{\mathbb{K}}$ is the absolute value of the discriminant of $\mathbb{K}$ and $n_{\mathbb{K}}$ its degree. For $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{Q}[q]$, one has that $\log\Delta_{\mathbb{K}} = \varphi(q)\log q-\varphi(q)\sum_{p|q}\frac{\log p}{p-1}$ (see [14, Prop. 2.17]) and $n_{\mathbb{K}} = \varphi(q)$, thus this formula becomes

$$\sum_{|\gamma|\geq T} \frac{\pi}{|\rho|^2} \leq \Big(1+\frac{2.89}{T}\Big)\frac{\varphi(q)}{T}\Big(\log q-\sum_{p|q}\frac{\log p}{p-1}+\log\Big(\frac{T}{2\pi}\Big)\Big)+\Big(1+\frac{18.61}{T}\Big)\frac{\varphi(q)}{T}+\frac{17.31}{T^2}$$

for all $T \geq 5$. We simplify this to

$$\sum_{|\gamma|\geq T} \frac{\pi}{|\rho|^2} \leq \Big(1+\frac{2.89}{T}\Big)\frac{\varphi(q)}{T}\log(qT) \tag{3.9}$$

for all $T \geq 16$. We get the claim by combining (3.8) and (3.9). □

Collecting the results in Lemmas 2.1, 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 we get

$$\sum_{n=a\,[q]} \Lambda(n)K(x-n;h) \geq \frac{h^2}{\varphi(q)}-|M_{a,q}\Delta_{2,h}\Sigma_{\chi^*,1}|-\frac{4}{\pi}\Big(x^{3/2}+\frac{h^2}{4\sqrt{x}}\Big)\Big(1+\frac{2.89}{T}\Big)\frac{\log(qT)}{T}$$
$$-\omega(q)h\log(2x)-\Big[1.7\Big|\delta_{\pm1[q]}(a)-\frac{2}{\varphi(q)}\Big|\frac{h^2}{x}+\delta_{\pm1[q]}(a)\frac{6h^2}{x(x-1)}\Big].$$

We simplify it by noticing that

$$1.7\Big|\delta_{\pm1[q]}(a)-\frac{2}{\varphi(q)}\Big|\frac{h^2}{x}+\delta_{\pm1[q]}(a)\frac{6h^2}{x(x-1)} \leq 1.7\frac{h^2}{x}$$

when $q \geq 3$ (thus $\varphi(q) \geq 2$) and $x \geq 2\varphi(q)+1$. In this way we deduce that

$$\sum_{n=a\,[q]} \Lambda(n)K(x-n;h) \geq \frac{h^2}{\varphi(q)}-|M_{a,q}\Delta_{2,h}\Sigma_{\chi^*,1}|-4\Big(x^{3/2}+\frac{h^2}{4\sqrt{x}}\Big)\Big(1+\frac{2.89}{T}\Big)\frac{\log(qT)}{\pi T}$$

$$-\omega(q)h\log(2x)-1.7\frac{h^2}{x}.$$

Now we remove the contribution of prime powers. We get

$$\sum_{n=a\,[q]}\Lambda(n)K(x-n;h)\le h\sum_{\substack{|n-x|<h\\ n=a\,[q]}}\Lambda(n)=h\Big(\sum_{\substack{|p-x|<h\\ p=a\,[q]}}\log p+\sum_{2\le k}\sum_{\substack{|p^k-x|<h\\ p^k=a\,[q]}}\log p\Big)$$

and removing the arithmetical condition one gets

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{2\le k}\sum_{\substack{|p^k-x|<h\\ p^k=a\,[q]}}\log p&\le\sum_{2\le k}\sum_{|p^k-x|<h}\log p\le[\psi(x+h)-\vartheta(x+h)]-[\psi(x-h)-\vartheta(x-h)]\\&\le(1+10^{-6})\sqrt{x+h}+3\sqrt[3]{x+h}-0.998684\sqrt{x-h}\end{aligned}$$

for every $x\ge 121$ (see [11, Cor. 2] and [12, Th. 6]). Assuming that $h\le 5x/6$ (as we have done for Lemma 3.2) we have

$$\sum_{2\le k}\sum_{\substack{|p^k-x|<h\\ p^k=a\,[q]}}\log p\le 0.95\sqrt{x}+3.7\sqrt[3]{x}. \tag{3.10}$$

Note that the Brun–Titchmarsh theorem for primes in arithmetic progressions (eventually in intervals – see [9]) produces a much better bound, but only when x and q are much larger than what we need to prove our theorem. As a consequence we have decided not to use this tool.
To summarise so far, we have proved that for $q\ge 3$, $x\ge\max(121,2\varphi(q)+1)$ and $h\le\frac{5}{6}x$ one has

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\substack{|p-x|<h\\ p=a\,[q]}}\log p\ge&\frac{h}{\varphi(q)}-\frac{1}{h}|M_{a,q}\Delta_{2,h}\Sigma_{\chi^*,1}|-4\Big(x^{3/2}+\frac{h^2}{4\sqrt{x}}\Big)\Big(1+\frac{2.89}{T}\Big)\frac{\log(qT)}{\pi hT}\\&-(0.95\sqrt{x}+3.7\sqrt[3]{x})-\omega(q)\log(2x)-1.7\frac{h}{x}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

In Section 4 we provide an upper bound for $M_{a,q}\Delta_{2,h}\Sigma_{\chi^*,1}$. In this way we will be able to prove the theorems in Sections 5 and 6.

4. Bound for $M_{a,q}\Delta_{2,h}\Sigma_{\chi^*,1}$

Lemma 4.1. *Let $y>0$. Then for some $\theta\in[-1,1]$ we have that*

$$\int_0^y\frac{\sin^2 t}{t^2}\,\mathrm{d}t=\frac{\pi}{2}-\frac{1}{2y}+\frac{\theta}{4y^2}.$$

The claim with $\theta\in[-2,2]$ has a very simple proof. We optimize the result by proving the stronger bound $\theta\in[-1,1]$.

Proof. We note that

$$\int_0^y\frac{\sin^2 t}{t^2}\,\mathrm{d}t=\frac{\pi}{2}-\int_y^\infty\frac{\sin^2 t}{t^2}\,\mathrm{d}t=\frac{\pi}{2}-\int_y^\infty\frac{1-\cos(2t)}{2t^2}\,\mathrm{d}t=\frac{\pi}{2}-\frac{1}{2y}+\int_y^\infty\frac{\cos(2t)}{2t^2}\,\mathrm{d}t.$$

Therefore the claim states that $|f(x)|\le 1$ when $x>0$, where $f(x):=x^2\int_x^{+\infty}\frac{\cos v}{v^2}\,\mathrm{d}v$. We prove this statement in two steps.

Step 1) The claim holds in $[0,6]$.
We notice that f is the unique bounded solution in $(0,+\infty)$ of the ODE $y'=\frac{2}{x}(y-\frac{x}{2}\cos x)$. We can use this equation to trace the graph of $f(x)$ in $[0,6]$. The extremal points of f solve $f(x)=\frac{x}{2}\cos x=:g(x)$, so $|f(x)|<1$ when $0<x\le 2.4$, since $\frac{x}{2}|\cos x|<1$ here. Moreover, $f(5)=0.896\ldots$ so that $f'(5)>\frac{2}{5}(0.896-\frac{5}{2}\cos(5))>0$, and $f(5.1)=0.899\ldots$ so that $f'(5)<\frac{2}{5.1}(0.9-\frac{5.1}{2}\cos(5.1))<0$, thus f is increasing for $x\in[2.4,5]$ (by the differential equation) and smaller than 1 here (because $f(5)<1$). Moreover there is a maximum for f in $[5,5.1]$, and since $g(x)<0.97$ here, we conclude that $|f(x)|<1$ in $[0,5.1]$. Moreover,

$g(x)$ increases for $x \in [5.1, 6]$ and $f(6) = 0.50\ldots < g(6)$, thus $f(x)$ decreases here, and the value of $f(6)$ completes the proof of this step.

Step 2) The claim holds for $x \geq 6$.

Four applications of integrations by parts give

$$f(x) = -\sin x + 2\frac{\cos x}{x} + 6\frac{\sin x}{x^2} - 24\frac{\cos x}{x^3} + 120x^2 \int_x^{+\infty} \frac{\cos v}{v^6}\,\mathrm{d}v$$

so that

$$|f(x)| \leq \left|\left(1-\frac{6}{x^2}\right)\sin x - \frac{2}{x}\left(1-\frac{12}{x^2}\right)\cos x\right| + \frac{24}{x^3}.$$

We prove that this function is lower than 1 for $x \geq 6$. Multiplying by x^2, we have to prove that

$$-x^2 + \frac{24}{x} < (x^2-6)\sin x - \frac{2}{x}(x^2-12)\cos x < x^2 - \frac{24}{x}.$$

The first inequality is evident when $\cos x \leq 0$, and the second when $\cos x \geq 0$, respectively (because we are assuming $x \geq 6$). Assuming $\cos x > 0$ for the first one, and $\cos x < 0$ for the second one, both remaining inequalities are implied by the stronger bound:

$$(x^2-6)\left|\sin x - \frac{2}{x}\cos x\right| < x^2 - \frac{24}{x}.$$

Since $|\sin x - \alpha\cos x| \leq \sqrt{1+\alpha^2} \leq 1+\frac{\alpha^2}{2}$ (the first inequality by elementary trigonometry, the second by convexity), it is sufficient to prove that

$$(x^2-6)\left(1+\frac{2}{x^2}\right) < x^2 - \frac{24}{x},$$

which in fact holds for $x \geq 6$.

□

Lemma 4.2. *Let $0 \leq h < x$. Then for every $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ there exists $\theta \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|\theta| \leq 1$ such that*

$$\left(1+\frac{h}{x}\right)^{\frac{3}{2}+i\gamma} - 2 + \left(1-\frac{h}{x}\right)^{\frac{3}{2}+i\gamma} = -4\sin^2\left(\frac{\gamma h}{2x}\right) + \theta(2|\gamma|+1)\frac{h^2}{x^2}.$$

Proof. The proof is straightforward and follows from the Taylor expansion of $\log(1+u)$ and some elementary inequalities. □

The definitions of $\Delta_{2,h}$ and $\Sigma_{\chi^*,1}$ show that

$$\Delta_{2,h}\Sigma_{\chi^*,1} = \sum_{\substack{\rho\in Z_{\chi^*}\\ |\mathrm{Im}(\rho)|\leq T}} \frac{(x+h)^{\rho+1} - 2x^{\rho+1} + (x-h)^{\rho+1}}{\rho(\rho+1)},$$

so that by Lemma 4.2 we deduce that

$$|\Delta_{2,h}\Sigma_{\chi^*,1}| \leq 4x^{3/2} \sum_{\substack{\frac{1}{2}+i\gamma\in Z_{\chi^*}\\ |\gamma|\leq T}} \frac{\sin^2\left(\frac{\gamma h}{2x}\right)}{|(\frac{1}{2}+i\gamma)(\frac{3}{2}+i\gamma)|} + \frac{h^2}{\sqrt{x}} \sum_{\substack{\frac{1}{2}+i\gamma\in Z_{\chi^*}\\ |\gamma|\leq T}} \frac{2|\gamma|+1}{|(\frac{1}{2}+i\gamma)(\frac{3}{2}+i\gamma)|}.$$

As we have done for $\Sigma_{\chi^*,2}$ we use the factorization of the Dedekind zeta function $\zeta_{\mathbb{K}}$ of the cyclotomic field $\mathbb{K} := \mathbb{Q}[q]$ of q-th roots of unity as products of $L(s,\chi^*)$; in this way we deal with all zeros in $\cup_{\chi\in(\mathbb{Z}/q\mathbb{Z})^*} Z_{\chi^*}$ as a unique step. This does not affect the main part of the theorem, but reduces the size of the secondary terms, and makes the ranges for q and x wider in the theorem.

$$\varphi(q)|M_{a,q}\Delta_{2,h}\Sigma_{\chi^*,1}| \leq \sum_{\chi\in(\mathbb{Z}/q\mathbb{Z})^*} \left[4x^{3/2} \sum_{\substack{\frac{1}{2}+i\gamma\in Z_{\chi^*}\\ |\gamma|\leq T}} \frac{\sin^2\left(\frac{\gamma h}{2x}\right)}{|(\frac{1}{2}+i\gamma)(\frac{3}{2}+i\gamma)|} + \frac{h^2}{\sqrt{x}} \sum_{\substack{\frac{1}{2}+i\gamma\in Z_{\chi^*}\\ |\gamma|\leq T}} \frac{2|\gamma|+1}{|(\frac{1}{2}+i\gamma)(\frac{3}{2}+i\gamma)|}\right]$$

$$= 4x^{3/2} \sum_{\substack{\frac{1}{2}+i\gamma\in Z_q\\ |\gamma|\leq T}} \frac{\sin^2\left(\frac{\gamma h}{2x}\right)}{|(\frac{1}{2}+i\gamma)(\frac{3}{2}+i\gamma)|} + \frac{h^2}{\sqrt{x}} \sum_{\substack{\frac{1}{2}+i\gamma\in Z_q\\ |\gamma|\leq T}} \frac{2|\gamma|+1}{|(\frac{1}{2}+i\gamma)(\frac{3}{2}+i\gamma)|}. \tag{4.1}$$

We deduce a bound for the second sum from two computations already made by the second and third author for Dedekind zeta functions.

Lemma 4.3. *Assume GRH and let $T \geq 20$. Then*

$$\frac{1}{\varphi(q)} \sum_{\substack{\frac{1}{2}+i\gamma \in Z_q \\ |\gamma| \leq T}} \frac{2|\gamma|+1}{|(\frac{1}{2}+i\gamma)(\frac{3}{2}+i\gamma)|} \leq \frac{1}{\pi} \log(q^2T) \log T + 1.93 \log q - 4.35 + \frac{21.67}{\varphi(q)}.$$

Proof. In [4, Eq. (3.8)] it is proved that

$$\sum_{\frac{1}{2}+i\gamma \in Z_q} \frac{\pi}{|\frac{1}{2}+i\gamma|} \leq \Big(\log\Big(\frac{T}{2\pi}\Big)+4.01\Big)\log\Delta_q + \Big(\frac{1}{2}\log^2\Big(\frac{T}{2\pi}\Big)-1.41\Big)\varphi(q)+25.57;$$

and in [3, Lemma 4.1] that

$$\sum_{\frac{1}{2}+i\gamma \in Z_q} \frac{1}{|(\frac{1}{2}+i\gamma)(\frac{3}{2}+i\gamma)|} \leq 0.54 \log\Delta_q - 1.03\varphi(q) + 5.39$$

(both for $T \geq 5$). Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\substack{\frac{1}{2}+i\gamma \in Z_q \\ |\gamma| \leq T}} \frac{2|\gamma|+1}{|(\frac{1}{2}+i\gamma)(\frac{3}{2}+i\gamma)|} \leq \sum_{\substack{\frac{1}{2}+i\gamma \in Z_q \\ |\gamma| \leq T}} \frac{2}{|\frac{1}{2}+i\gamma|} + \sum_{\frac{1}{2}+i\gamma \in Z_q} \frac{1}{|(\frac{1}{2}+i\gamma)(\frac{3}{2}+i\gamma)|} \\
&\leq \frac{2}{\pi}\Big[\Big(\log\Big(\frac{T}{2\pi}\Big)+4.01\Big)\log\Delta_q + \Big(\frac{1}{2}\log^2\Big(\frac{T}{2\pi}\Big)-1.41\Big)\varphi(q)+25.57\Big] + 0.54\log\Delta_q - 1.03\varphi(q) + 5.39
\end{aligned}$$

and recalling that $\log\Delta_q = \varphi(q)\log q - \varphi(q)\sum_{p|q}\frac{\log p}{p-1} \leq \varphi(q)\log q$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{\varphi(q)} \sum_{\substack{\frac{1}{2}+i\gamma \in Z_q \\ |\gamma| \leq T}} \frac{2|\gamma|+1}{|(\frac{1}{2}+i\gamma)(\frac{3}{2}+i\gamma)|} &\leq \Big(\frac{2}{\pi}\log\Big(\frac{T}{2\pi}\Big)+3.1\Big)\log q + \Big(\frac{1}{\pi}\log^2\Big(\frac{T}{2\pi}\Big)-1.927\Big) + \frac{21.67}{\varphi(q)} \\
&= \frac{1}{\pi}\log(q^2T)\log T + \Big(3.1 - \frac{2}{\pi}\log(2\pi)\Big)\log q - \frac{2}{\pi}\log T\log(2\pi) + \frac{1}{\pi}\log^2(2\pi) - 1.927 + \frac{21.67}{\varphi(q)}.
\end{aligned}$$

The claim follows by recalling that we are assuming $T \geq 20$ so that the contribution of all secondary terms is -4.35, at most. □

Lemma 4.4. *Assume GRH and Let $\mathbb{K}$ be any number field. Then*

$$\sum_{|\gamma| \leq 5} \frac{\gamma^2}{|(\frac{1}{2}+i\gamma)(\frac{3}{2}+i\gamma)|} \leq 1.5\log\Delta_{\mathbb{K}} + 1.651 n_{\mathbb{K}} - 1.577.$$

Proof. We apply the same technique we have already used for Lemmas 3.1 and 4.1 in [3] and for Lemma 3.1 in [4], stemming from the remark that function $f_{\mathbb{K}}(s) := \sum_\rho \mathrm{Re}\big(\frac{2}{s-\rho}\big)$ can be exactly computed via the alternative representation

$$f_{\mathbb{K}}(s) = 2\mathrm{Re}\frac{\zeta_{\mathbb{K}}'}{\zeta_{\mathbb{K}}}(s) + \log\frac{\Delta_{\mathbb{K}}}{\pi^{n_{\mathbb{K}}}} + \mathrm{Re}\Big(\frac{2}{s}+\frac{2}{s-1}\Big) + (r_1+r_2)\mathrm{Re}\frac{\Gamma'}{\Gamma}\Big(\frac{s}{2}\Big) + r_2\mathrm{Re}\frac{\Gamma'}{\Gamma}\Big(\frac{s+1}{2}\Big). \tag{4.2}$$

Let

$$f(s,\gamma) := \frac{4(2s-1)}{(2s-1)^2+4\gamma^2},$$

so that $f_{\mathbb{K}}(s) = \sum_\gamma f(s,\gamma)$, and let

$$g(\gamma) := \frac{\gamma^2}{((\frac{1}{4}+\gamma^2)(\frac{9}{4}+\gamma^2))^{1/2}}$$

so that $\sum_{|\gamma|\le 5}\frac{\gamma^2}{|(\frac12+i\gamma)(\frac32+i\gamma)|}=\sum_\gamma g(\gamma)$. We look for a finite linear combination of $f(s,\gamma)$ at suitable points s_j such that

$$g(\gamma)\le F(\gamma):=\sum_j a_j f(s_j,\gamma) \tag{4.3}$$

for all $\gamma\in\mathbb{R}$ so that

$$\sum_{|\gamma|\le 5}\frac{\gamma^2}{|(\frac12+i\gamma)(\frac32+i\gamma)|}\le\sum_j a_j f_{\mathbb{K}}(s_j). \tag{4.4}$$

Once (4.4) is proved, we recover a bound for the sum on zeros by recalling the identity (4.2). According to this approach, the final coefficient of $\log\Delta_{\mathbb{K}}$ will be the sum of all a_j, and thus we are interested in the linear combinations for which this sum is as small as possible. We set $s_j=3/4+j/2$ with $j=1,\dots,2\kappa+3$ for a suitable integer κ. Let $\Upsilon\subset(0,\infty)$ be a set with κ numbers. We require:

(1) $F(\gamma)=g(\gamma)$ for all $\gamma\in\Upsilon\cup\{0,5\}$,
(2) $F'(\gamma)=g'(\gamma)$ for all $\gamma\in\Upsilon$,
(3) $\lim_{\gamma\to\infty}\gamma^2F(\gamma)=\lim_{\gamma\to\infty}\gamma^2g(\gamma)=0$.

This produces a set of $2\kappa+3$ linear equations for the $2\kappa+3$ constants a_j, and we hope that these satisfy (4.3) for every γ. We choose $\kappa:=10$ and $\Upsilon:=\{0.5,1.5,2,2.4,2.8,7.9,18,10^2,10^3,10^5\}$. Finally, with an abuse of notation we take for a_j the solution of the system, rounded above to 10^{-7}: this produces the numbers in Table 2.

TABLE 2. Constants for Lemma 4.4.

j	$a_j\cdot10^7$	j	$a_j\cdot10^7$
1	−10417203	13	−18920268046344982450
2	1056404889	14	29659178484686316889
3	−65191418930	15	−37103060687919097856
4	2306235683461	16	36963001195180424340
5	−50953892956052	17	−29124459758424138052
6	745294415104297	18	17917680016161661642
7	−7554469767270438	19	−8424311293805783518
8	55069155554895360	20	2923218093750242944
9	−297487524612176257	21	−705518033170496127
10	1219731091815491142	22	105765338120745449
11	−3866974934911032963	23	−7417073631321810
12	9612711864719121022		

Then, using Sturm's algorithm, we prove that the values found actually give an upper bound for g, so that (4.4) holds with such a_j's. These constants verify

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_j a_j=1.4999\dots, && \sum_j a_j\Big(\frac{2}{s_j}+\frac{2}{s_j-1}\Big)\le-1.577,\\ &\sum_j a_j\frac{\Gamma'}{\Gamma}\Big(\frac{s_j}{2}\Big)\le0.6552, && \sum_j a_j\frac{\Gamma'}{\Gamma}\Big(\frac{s_j+1}{2}\Big)\le0.7314.\end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

We write $\sum_j a_j\frac{\zeta_{\mathbb{K}}'}{\zeta_{\mathbb{K}}}(s_j)$ as

$$-\sum_n\tilde\Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}(n)S(n)\quad\text{with}\quad S(n):=\sum_j\frac{a_j}{n^{s_j}}.$$

We check numerically that $S(n) < 0$ for $n \le 10284$ with the exception of $S(4)$. Then, since the sign of a_j alternates, we can easily prove that each pair $\frac{a_1}{n^{s_1}}+\frac{a_2}{n^{s_2}}$, $\dots$, $\frac{a_{2q+1}}{n^{s_{2q+1}}}+\frac{a_{2q+2}}{n^{s_{2q+2}}}$ and the last term $\frac{a_{2q+3}}{n^{s_{2q+3}}}$ are negative for every $n \ge 10284$, thus

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_j a_j \frac{\zeta_{\mathbb{K}}'}{\zeta_{\mathbb{K}}}(s_j) &= -\sum_n \tilde{\Lambda}_{\mathbb{K}}(n)S(n) \le -n_{\mathbb{K}} \sum_{n\ne 4} \Lambda(n)S(n) \\ &= -n_{\mathbb{K}}\Big[\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \Lambda(n)S(n) - \Lambda(4)S(4)\Big] \\ &= n_{\mathbb{K}}\Big[\sum_j a_j \frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(s_j) + \Lambda(4)S(4)\Big] \le 1.3372 n_{\mathbb{K}}.\end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

The result now follows from (4.2), and (4.4–4.6). □

Thus, by (4.1) and Lemmas 4.3 and 4.4 we get

$$\begin{aligned}|M_{a,q}\Delta_{2,h}\Sigma_{\chi^*,1}| \le& \frac{4x^{3/2}}{\varphi(q)} \sum_{\substack{\frac12+i\gamma\in Z_q \\ 5\le|\gamma|\le T}} \frac{\sin^2\left(\frac{\gamma h}{2x}\right)}{|(\frac12+i\gamma)(\frac32+i\gamma)|} \\ &+\frac{h^2}{\sqrt{x}}\Big(\frac{1}{\pi}\log(q^2T)\log T + 3.43\log q - 2.699 + \frac{20.1}{\varphi(q)}\Big).\end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

To bound the sum by partial summation we need a formula for $N_q(T)$, the number of zeros ρ of $\zeta_{\mathbb{K}}$ with $\mathrm{Re}(\rho) \in (0,1)$ and $|\mathrm{Im}(\rho)| \le T$. Let $W_q(T) := \frac{T}{\pi}\log\big((\frac{T}{2\pi e})^{\varphi(q)}\Delta_q\big)$, and let $U_q(T) := N_q(T) - W_q(T)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|\frac{1}{\varphi(q)}N_q(T) - \frac{T}{\pi}\log\Big(\frac{T}{2\pi e}(\Delta_q)^{1/\varphi(q)}\Big)\Big| &= \frac{|U_q(T)|}{\varphi(q)} \\ &\le d_1\log\Big(\frac{T}{2\pi}(\Delta_q)^{1/\varphi(q)}\Big) + d_2 + \frac{d_3}{\varphi(q)} =: \frac{R_q(T)}{\varphi(q)} \qquad T \ge 5\end{aligned}$$

with $d_1 = 0.395$, $d_2 = 3.459$ and $d_3 = 2.559$ (this particular set of values is computed using the algorithm of Trudgian [13] with $\eta = 0.36$, $p = -\eta$ and $r = \frac{1+\eta-p}{1/2+\eta} = 2$.) Thus, by partial summation we get

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\substack{\frac12+i\gamma\in Z_q \\ 5<|\gamma|\le T}} \frac{\sin^2\left(\frac{\gamma h}{2x}\right)}{\gamma^2} &= \int_{5^+}^{T^+} \frac{\sin^2\left(\frac{\gamma h}{2x}\right)}{\gamma^2}\,\mathrm{d}N_q(\gamma) \\ &= \frac{\sin^2\left(\frac{hT}{2x}\right)}{T^2}N_q(T) - \sin^2\left(\frac{5h}{2x}\right)N_q(5^+) - \int_5^T \Big[\frac{\sin^2\left(\frac{\gamma h}{2x}\right)}{\gamma^2}\Big]' N_q(\gamma)\,\mathrm{d}\gamma \\ &= \frac{\sin^2\left(\frac{hT}{2x}\right)}{T^2}U_q(T) - \sin^2\left(\frac{5h}{2x}\right)U_q(5^+) \\ &\quad + \int_5^T \frac{\sin^2\left(\frac{\gamma h}{2x}\right)}{\gamma^2}\log\Big(\frac{\gamma^{\varphi(q)}\Delta_q}{2\pi}\Big)\frac{\mathrm{d}\gamma}{\pi} - \int_5^T \Big[\frac{\sin^2\left(\frac{\gamma h}{2x}\right)}{\gamma^2}\Big]' U_q(\gamma)\,\mathrm{d}\gamma.\end{aligned}$$

Recalling the upper bound $|U_q(T)| \le R_q(T)$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{\varphi(q)}\sum_{5<|\gamma|\le T} \frac{\sin^2\left(\frac{\gamma h}{2x}\right)}{\gamma^2} &\le \frac{R_q(T)}{\varphi(q)T^2} + \Big(\frac{5h}{2x}\Big)^2\frac{R_q(5)}{\varphi(q)} \\ &\quad + \int_5^T \frac{\sin^2\left(\frac{\gamma h}{2x}\right)}{\gamma^2}\log\Big(\frac{\gamma(\Delta_q)^{1/\varphi(q)}}{2\pi}\Big)\frac{\mathrm{d}\gamma}{\pi} + \frac{1}{\varphi(q)}\int_5^T \Big|\frac{h}{2x}\frac{\sin\left(\frac{\gamma h}{x}\right)}{\gamma^2} - 2\frac{\sin^2\left(\frac{\gamma h}{2x}\right)}{\gamma^3}\Big| R_q(\gamma)\,\mathrm{d}\gamma.\end{aligned}$$

Using the inequality $|\frac{\sin(2v)}{2}-\frac{\sin^2 v}{v}|\le\frac{4}{5}$, we simplify to get

$$\frac{1}{\varphi(q)}\sum_{5<|\gamma|\le T}\frac{\sin^2\left(\frac{\gamma h}{2x}\right)}{\gamma^2}\le\frac{R_q(T)}{\varphi(q)T^2}+\Big(\frac{5h}{2x}\Big)^2\frac{R_q(5)}{\varphi(q)}+\int_5^T\frac{\sin^2\left(\frac{\gamma h}{2x}\right)}{\gamma^2}\log\Big(\frac{\gamma(\Delta_q)^{1/\varphi(q)}}{2\pi}\Big)\frac{\mathrm{d}\gamma}{\pi}+\frac{4h}{5\varphi(q)x}\int_5^T\frac{R_q(\gamma)}{\gamma^2}\,\mathrm{d}\gamma,$$

and since $\int_5^{+\infty}\frac{R_q(\gamma)}{\gamma^2}\,\mathrm{d}\gamma\le 0.079\log\Delta_q+0.7528\varphi(q)+0.5118$, we get

$$\frac{1}{\varphi(q)}\sum_{5<|\gamma|\le T}\frac{\sin^2\left(\frac{\gamma h}{2x}\right)}{\gamma^2}\le\frac{h}{2\pi x}\int_0^{\frac{hT}{2x}}\frac{\sin^2 t}{t^2}\,\mathrm{d}t\log\Big(\frac{T(\Delta_q)^{1/\varphi(q)}}{2\pi}\Big)+\frac{(0.253\log\Delta_q+2.409\varphi(q)+1.638)h}{4\varphi(q)x}+\frac{R_q(T)}{\varphi(q)T^2}+\Big(\frac{5h}{2x}\Big)^2\frac{R_q(5)}{\varphi(q)}.$$

By Lemma 4.1 and the bound $R_q(T)\le 0.395\log(T^{\varphi(q)}\Delta_q)+2.74\varphi(q)+2.559$ for every $T\ge 5$, the bound becomes

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{\varphi(q)}\sum_{5<|\gamma|\le T}\frac{\sin^2\left(\frac{\gamma h}{2x}\right)}{\gamma^2}\\&\le\frac{h}{4x}\Big(1-\frac{2}{\pi}\frac{x}{hT}+\frac{2}{\pi}\frac{x^2}{h^2T^2}\Big)\log\Big(\frac{T(\Delta_q)^{1/\varphi(q)}}{2\pi}\Big)+\frac{(0.253\log\Delta_q+2.409\varphi(q)+1.638)h}{4\varphi(q)x}\\&\quad+\frac{0.395\log(T^{\varphi(q)}\Delta_q)+2.74\varphi(q)+2.559}{\varphi(q)T^2}+\Big(\frac{5h}{2x}\Big)^2\frac{0.395\log(5^{\varphi(q)}\Delta_q)+2.74\varphi(q)+2.559}{\varphi(q)}.\end{aligned}$$

We substitute $\log\Delta_q=\varphi(q)\log q-\varphi(q)\sum_{p|q}\frac{\log p}{p-1}$ in the first two terms, while for the last two we simply use the bound $\log\Delta_q\le\varphi(q)\log q$. Moreover, since for $q\ge 3$ we have $\varphi(q)\ge 2$, so we use this hypothesis to simplify the terms decaying as $1/T^2$. We get

$$\begin{aligned}&\le\frac{h}{4x}\Big(1-\frac{2}{\pi}\frac{x}{hT}+\frac{2}{\pi}\frac{x^2}{h^2T^2}\Big)\log\Big(\frac{qT}{2\pi}\Big)+\Big(0.253\log q-\sum_{p|q}\frac{\log p}{p-1}+2.409+\frac{1.638}{\varphi(q)}\Big)\frac{h}{4x}\\&\quad+\frac{0.395\log(qT)+4.02}{T^2}+\Big(2.469\log q+21.1+\frac{16}{\varphi(q)}\Big)\frac{h^2}{x^2},\end{aligned}$$

where we used that $1.253-\frac{2}{\pi}Y+\frac{2}{\pi}Y^2\ge 1$ to simplify the coefficient of $\sum_{p|q}$. Thus (4.7) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}|M_{a,q}\Delta_{2,h}\Sigma_{\chi^*,1}|\le{}&h\sqrt{x}\log\Big(\frac{qT}{2\pi}\Big)-\frac{2}{\pi}h\sqrt{x}\frac{x}{hT}\log\Big(\frac{qT}{2\pi}\Big)+\frac{2}{\pi}h\sqrt{x}\frac{x^2}{h^2T^2}\log\Big(\frac{qT}{2\pi}\Big)\\&+\Big(0.253\log q-\sum_{p|q}\frac{\log p}{p-1}+2.409+\frac{1.638}{\varphi(q)}\Big)h\sqrt{x}+(1.58\log(qT)+16.08)\frac{x^{3/2}}{T^2}\\&+\Big(\frac{1}{\pi}\log(q^2T)\log T+13.4\log q+81.8+\frac{84.1}{\varphi(q)}\Big)\frac{h^2}{\sqrt{x}}.\end{aligned}\tag{4.8}$$

5. Proof of Theorem 1.1

Substituting (4.8) into (3.11) and by (3.10) we get

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\substack{|p-x|<h\\ p=a\,[q]}}\log p\ge{}&\frac{h}{\varphi(q)}-\Big[\sqrt{x}\log\Big(\frac{qT}{2\pi}\Big)-\frac{2}{\pi}\sqrt{x}\frac{x}{hT}\log\Big(\frac{qT}{2\pi}\Big)+\frac{2}{\pi}\sqrt{x}\frac{x^2}{h^2T^2}\log\Big(\frac{qT}{2\pi}\Big)\\&+\Big(0.253\log q-\sum_{p|q}\frac{\log p}{p-1}+2.409+\frac{1.638}{\varphi(q)}\Big)\sqrt{x}+(1.58\log(qT)+16.08)\frac{x^{3/2}}{hT^2}\end{aligned}$$

$$+\Big(\frac{1}{\pi}\log(q^2T)\log T+13.4\log q+81.8+\frac{84.1}{\varphi(q)}\Big)\frac{h}{\sqrt{x}}\Big]$$
$$-4\Big(x^{3/2}+\frac{h^2}{4\sqrt{x}}\Big)\Big(1+\frac{2.89}{T}\Big)\frac{\log(qT)}{\pi hT}$$
$$-0.95\sqrt{x}-3.7\sqrt[3]{x}-\omega(q)\log(2x)-1.7\frac{h}{x}.$$

We introduce a new parameter β defined as $hT =: \beta x$. Thus, the previous inequality becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{\sqrt{x}}\sum_{\substack{|p-x|<h\\ p=a\,[q]}}\log p \geq{}& \frac{h/\sqrt{x}}{\varphi(q)}-\Big(1+\frac{2}{\pi\beta}+\frac{2}{\pi\beta^2}+\frac{4\cdot2.89}{\pi\beta T}\Big)\log(qT)-0.253\log q\\ &-\Big(\frac{1}{\pi}\log(q^2T)\log T+13.4\log q+81.8+\frac{84.1}{\varphi(q)}+\frac{1.58\log(qT)+16.08}{\beta^2}+\Big(1+\frac{2.89}{T}\Big)\frac{\log(qT)}{\pi T}\Big)\frac{h}{x}\\ &-1.53-\sum_{p|q}\frac{\log p}{p-1}-\frac{1.638}{\varphi(q)}-\frac{2\log(2\pi)}{\pi\beta}\Big(1-\frac{1}{\beta}\Big)-3.7x^{-1/6}-\omega(q)\frac{\log(2x)}{\sqrt{x}}-1.7\frac{h}{x^{3/2}}.\end{aligned}\tag{5.1}$$

We simplify this formula by noticing that for $\beta \geq 20$ and $x \geq (10\varphi(q)\log q)^2$ (unfortunately we cannot hope to prove anything as strong as this one, so that these assumptions will be satisfied), the function appearing in the last line is larger than -2 for $q \geq 18$ (we use the assumption $\frac{h}{x} \leq \frac{5}{6}$ to bound $\frac{h}{x^{3/2}}$ with $\frac{5/6}{\sqrt{x}}$, and when $q \geq 800$ we apply the bounds $\omega(q) \leq \log q$ and $\varphi(q) \geq \sqrt{q}$). Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{\sqrt{x}}\sum_{\substack{|p-x|<h\\ p=a\,[q]}}\log p \geq{}& \frac{h/\sqrt{x}}{\varphi(q)}-\Big(1+\frac{2}{\pi\beta}+\frac{2}{\pi\beta^2}+\frac{4\cdot2.89}{\pi\beta T}\Big)\log(qT)-0.253\log q-2\\ &-\Big(\frac{1}{\pi}\log(q^2T)\log T+13.4\log q+81.8+\frac{84.1}{\varphi(q)}+\frac{1.58\log(qT)+16.08}{\beta^2}+\Big(1+\frac{2.89}{T}\Big)\frac{\log(qT)}{\pi T}\Big)\frac{h}{x}.\end{aligned}\tag{5.2}$$

We introduce three nonnegative parameters α, δ and ρ, and we further set

$$h=\varphi(q)(\alpha\log x+\delta\log q+\rho)\sqrt{x},\qquad T=\frac{\beta}{\varphi(q)}\frac{\sqrt{x}}{\alpha\log x+\delta\log q+\rho}.$$

For the first part of the theorem, that is, the existence of a prime $p=a \pmod q$ with $|p-x|\leq h$, it is sufficient to prove that the function appearing on the right hand side of (5.2) is positive. This happens when

$$(1-F)(\alpha\log x+\delta\log q+\rho) > G\tag{5.3}$$

where

$$F(q,x) := \Big(\frac{\log(q^2T)\log T}{\pi}+13.4\log q+81.8+\frac{84.1}{\varphi(q)}+\frac{1.58\log(qT)+16.08}{\beta^2}+\Big(1+\frac{2.89}{T}\Big)\frac{\log(qT)}{\pi T}\Big)\frac{\varphi(q)}{\sqrt{x}},$$
$$G(q,x) := \Big(1+\frac{2}{\pi\beta}+\frac{2}{\pi\beta^2}+\frac{4\cdot2.89}{\pi\beta T}\Big)\log(qT)+0.253\log q+2.$$

We still have to make a choice for β, for which we have two different requirements.
CASE 1. Consider $x\to\infty$, for a fixed q. Then $\log T\sim\frac{1}{2}\log x$, as soon as $\log\beta=o(\log x)$. Thus $F\ll\frac{\log^2 x}{\sqrt{x}}$, and to prove (5.3) we need

$$\alpha\log x+\rho > \Big(\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{\pi\beta}+\frac{1}{\pi\beta^2}\Big)\log x+O(1),$$

not uniformly in q and in the other parameters. Thus we need

$$\alpha > \frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{\pi\beta}+\frac{1}{\pi\beta^2},$$

and we can improve this bound to $\alpha \geq \frac{1}{2}$ if we assume that $\beta \asymp \log x$, at the cost of increasing ρ.
CASE 2. Consider $q \to \infty$, and $x = x_0(q) = (m\varphi(q)\log q)^2$ for some constant m. Then

$$T = \frac{m\beta}{2\alpha+\delta} + O\Big(\frac{\log\log q}{\log q}\Big),$$

not uniformly in α, δ, ρ and m. In particular, it stays bounded if we assume that β is bounded, and

$$F = \frac{1}{m}\Big(\frac{2}{\pi}\log T + 13.4 + \frac{1.58}{\beta^2} + \Big(1+\frac{2.89}{T}\Big)\frac{1}{\pi T} + O\Big(\frac{1}{\log q}\Big)\Big).$$

Thus F is small if m is large enough, and (5.3) is implied by

$$(2\alpha+\delta)\log q + \rho > (1-F)^{-1}\Big(1.253 + \frac{2}{\pi\beta} + \frac{2}{\pi\beta^2} + \frac{4\cdot 2.89}{\pi\beta T}\Big)\log q + O(1),$$

because $\varphi(q)\log q \gg q$. Thus it is sufficient to have

$$2\alpha+\delta \geq \Big(1-\frac{1}{m}\Big(\frac{2}{\pi}\log T + 13.4 + \frac{1.58}{\beta^2} + \Big(1+\frac{2.89}{T}\Big)\frac{1}{\pi T}\Big)\Big)^{-1}\Big(1.253 + \frac{2}{\pi\beta} + \frac{2}{\pi\beta^2} + \frac{4\cdot 2.89}{\pi\beta T}\Big),$$

at the cost of increasing ρ.

In order to meet both requirements for β we set

$$\beta = \ell \log\Big(\frac{\sqrt{x}}{\varphi(q)\log q}\Big), \tag{5.4}$$

for a suitable constant $\ell > 0$ that we will set later. In this way we can set $\alpha = 1/2$, and δ will be close to 0.253, specifically: $|\delta - 0.253| \ll \frac{\log(\ell m)}{m} + \frac{1}{\ell\log m}$. Obviously we are interested in producing small values for m. Thus, for a fixed value of α and δ we select the value of ℓ producing the minimum m such that (δ, ℓ, m) satisfies the requirements.
If one is interested mainly in the q aspect, then one can select $\alpha = 1.253/2$; in this way δ can be chosen arbitrarily small if m and ℓ are large enough, and the value $\delta = 0$ is possible for every $\alpha > 1.253/2$. Possible choices are in Table 3.

The previous argument has showed how we have to set β, and what we can expect to be able to prove. However, in order to get a true proof we need to convert (5.3) into something decreasing in x when all other parameters are fixed, because only in this way can we prove the claim for all $x \geq x_0$ by testing it only in x_0.
We notice that according to our definitions both β and T increase as functions of x, at least for $x \geq 10$. Moreover, setting $u := \sqrt{x}$, one sees that $\frac{1}{u}\log^2 T$ decreases if and only if

$$\frac{2\log T}{u}\frac{d\log T}{du} \leq \frac{\log^2 T}{u^2} \iff 2u\frac{d\log T}{du} \leq \log T \iff 2\Big[\frac{1}{\log u} + 1 - \frac{2\alpha}{(2\alpha\log u + \delta\log q + \rho)}\Big] \leq \log T$$
$$\Leftarrow 2 + \frac{4}{\log x} \leq \log T.$$

For $x \geq 100$, this is true whenever $T \geq 20$. This suffices to prove that in this range $F(q,x)$ decreases as a function of x. Unfortunately this is false for G, thus we have to modify it into a new $\overline{G}$ having a better behavior in x and such that $\overline{G} \geq G$ so that

$$(1-F)(\alpha\log x + \delta\log q + \rho) > \overline{G} \tag{5.5}$$

implies (5.3).
Firstly, we notice that for $x =: u^2$ moderately larger than 100, the function $\frac{1}{u}\log^2 T\log u$ decreases as well. In fact, this happens if and only if

$$\frac{2\log T\log u}{u}\frac{d\log T}{du} + \frac{\log^2 T}{u^2} \leq \frac{\log^2 T\log u}{u^2} \iff 2u\frac{d\log T}{du} + \frac{\log T}{\log u} \leq \log T \tag{5.6}$$
$$\iff 2\Big[\frac{1}{\log u} + 1 - \frac{2\alpha}{(2\alpha\log u + \delta\log q + \rho)}\Big] \leq \Big[1 - \frac{1}{\log u}\Big]\log T \Leftarrow 2\frac{\log x + 2}{\log x - 2} \leq \log T$$

and for $x \geq 23000$ this is true whenever $T \geq 20$, once again. This proves that in this range also $F(q,x)\log x$ decreases as a function of x. Secondly, recalling our setting for T and β, we see that

$$qT = \frac{q\ell\sqrt{x}}{\varphi(q)} \frac{\log\left(\frac{\sqrt{x}}{\varphi(q)\log q}\right)}{\alpha\log x + \delta\log q + \rho} \leq \frac{q\ell\sqrt{x}}{2\alpha\varphi(q)}.$$

We use this bound to substitute $\log(qT)$ in G, producing

$$\overline{G}(q,x) := \Big(1+\frac{2}{\pi\beta}+\frac{2}{\pi\beta^2}+\frac{4\cdot 2.89}{\pi\beta T}\Big)\log\Big(\frac{q\ell\sqrt{x}}{2\alpha\varphi(q)}\Big)+0.253\log q+2.$$

With this $\overline{G}$, Inequality (5.5) may be written as

$$\begin{aligned}(5.7)\quad \Big(\alpha-\frac{1}{2}\Big)\log x + (1-F)(\delta\log q+\rho) > \alpha F\log x + \Big(\frac{1}{\pi\beta}+\frac{1}{\pi\beta^2}+\frac{2\cdot 2.89}{\pi\beta T}\Big)\log x \\ + \Big(1+\frac{2}{\pi\beta}+\frac{2}{\pi\beta^2}+\frac{4\cdot 2.89}{\pi\beta T}\Big)\log\Big(\frac{q\ell}{2\alpha\varphi(q)}\Big)+0.253\log q+2.\end{aligned}$$

When $\alpha \geq 1/2$, the function appearing on the left hand side increases in x (whenever $x \geq 100$, $T \geq 20$), while the function on the right hand side decreases in x (whenever $x \geq 23000$, $T \geq 20$). This shows that if $x \geq 23000$ and $\alpha \geq 1/2$, we can check (5.7) (and hence (5.5), since they are equivalent) for $x \geq x_0$ by testing it for x_0.
We also have to satisfy the assumption

$$(5.8)\qquad \frac{1}{T} = \frac{\varphi(q)}{\sqrt{x}} \frac{\alpha\log x+\delta\log q+\rho}{\ell\log(\frac{\sqrt{x}}{\varphi(q)\log q})} \leq \frac{1}{20},$$

and, since we have assumed $h \leq 5x/6$ in several places, we need also

$$(5.9)\qquad \frac{h}{x} = \frac{\varphi(q)}{\sqrt{x}}(\alpha\log x+\delta\log q+\rho) \leq \frac{5}{6},$$

where again the functions appearing on the left hand sides decrease in x (for $x \geq e^2$).

The combinations of values for the parameters α, δ, and m in Table 3 are in some sense unrealistic: they can be satisfied only for extremely large q. In order to have a claim which could be proved for every q we have to increase m and choose ρ accordingly. Our choices are in Table 4, and for every choice of the parameters appearing there we verify by direct computation that all requirements are satisfied by $x = x_0(q) := (m\varphi(q)\log q)^2$ when $3 \leq q \leq q_0$, with just a few exceptions which are in Table 5 and for which we have to test the claim directly for $x \in [x_0(q), x(q)]$.

To deal with larger q's, we set $x = x_0(q) = (m\varphi(q)\log q)^2$ in (5.5), but, again, we have to modify $F_0(q) = F(q, x_0(q))$ and $\overline{G}_0(q) = \overline{G}(q, x_0(q))$ in order to produce an inequality which will hold for every $q \geq q_0$ when verified for q_0. For this purpose we introduce

$$\tilde{F}_0(q) := \frac{1}{m}\Big(\frac{\log(q^2T_+)\log T_+}{\pi\log q}+13.4+\frac{81.8}{\log q}+\frac{84.1}{q}+\frac{1.58\log(qT_+)+16.08}{\beta_0^2\log q}+\Big(1+\frac{2.89}{T_-}\Big)\frac{\log(qT_+)}{\pi T_-\log q}\Big)$$

and

$$\tilde{G}_0(q) := \Big(1+\frac{2}{\pi\beta_0}+\frac{2}{\pi\beta_0^2}+\frac{4\cdot 2.89}{\pi\beta_0 T_-}\Big)\log\Big(\frac{\ell mq\log q}{2\alpha}\Big)+0.253\log q+2$$

with

$$\beta_0 := \ell\log m, \qquad T_- := \frac{\beta_0 m\log q}{2\alpha\log(mq\log q)+\delta\log q+\rho}, \qquad T_+ := \frac{\beta_0 m}{2\alpha+\delta}.$$

Then for $x = x_0(q)$ one has $\beta = \beta_0$, $T_- \leq T \leq T_+$, $\tilde{F}_0(q) \geq F_0(q)$ and $\tilde{G}_0(q) \geq \overline{G}_0(q)$, so that (5.5) for $x = x_0(q)$ holds for sure if

$$(5.10)\qquad (1-\tilde{F}_0(q))(2\alpha\log(mq)+\delta\log q+\rho) \geq \tilde{G}_0(q).$$

We notice that $\tilde{F}_0(q)$ and $1/T_-$ decrease in q, thus (5.10) may be written as

$$\Big((1-\tilde{F}_0(q))(2\alpha+\delta)-\Big(1.253+\frac{2}{\pi\beta_0}+\frac{2}{\pi\beta_0^2}+\frac{4\cdot 2.89}{\pi\beta_0 T_-}\Big)\Big)\log q \geq \Big(1+\frac{2}{\pi\beta_0}+\frac{2}{\pi\beta_0^2}+\frac{4\cdot 2.89}{\pi\beta_0 T_-}\Big)\log\log q$$

$$+(\tilde{F}_0(q)-1)(2\alpha\log m+\rho)+\Big(1+\frac{2}{\pi\beta_0}+\frac{2}{\pi\beta_0^2}+\frac{4\cdot 2.89}{\pi\beta_0 T_-}\Big)\log\Big(\frac{\ell m}{2\alpha}\Big)+2$$

i.e., as

$$A\log q-B\log\log q-C\geq 0 \tag{5.11}$$

where A increases in q and B and C decrease. The function on the left hand side is increasing in q when

$$A'\log q-B'\log\log q+\frac{A}{q}-\frac{B}{q\log q}-C'>0,$$

and for this it is sufficient to have

$$-\tilde{F}_0'(q)(2\alpha+\delta)\log q+\frac{A}{q}-\frac{B}{q\log q}>0.$$

Since

$$-\tilde{F}_0'(q)\geq\frac{S}{q\log^2 q}\quad\text{with}\quad S:=\frac{1}{m}\Big(\frac{\log^2 T_+}{\pi}+81.8+\frac{1.58\log T_++16.08}{\beta_0^2}\Big), \tag{5.12}$$

in order to have a monotonous behavior of (5.11) it is sufficient to have

$$A\log q\geq B-S(2\alpha+\delta). \tag{5.13}$$

In this way we see that if (5.11) holds for a certain $q=q_0$ large enough to satisfy (5.13), then it is proved for every $q\geq q_0$. Moreover, we notice that inequalities (5.8) and (5.9) in $x_0(q)=(m\varphi(q)\log q)^2$ are satisfied as soon as

$$\frac{1}{T_-}=\frac{2\alpha\log(mq\log q)+\delta\log q+\rho}{\ell m\log m\log q}\leq\frac{1}{20}, \tag{5.14}$$

and

$$\frac{2\alpha\log(mq\log q)+\delta\log q+\rho}{m\log q}\leq\frac{5}{6}. \tag{5.15}$$

Thus (finally!) we have produced the test we were looking for: we search for a q_0 satisfying (5.10), (5.13), (5.14) and (5.15). Then everything is proved for $q\geq q_0$. Our computations show that the values of q_0 appearing in Table 4 pass this test.

For $q\leq q_0$ and $x\in[x_0(q),x(q)]$ we use the mighty computer procedure `Check1` described below so that now the proof of the first claim of the theorem is complete.

For the second part of the theorem, i.e. the claim ensuring that if we increase α by one then there are at least $\sqrt{x}$ primes $p=a\pmod q$ in $|p-x|\leq h$, we proceed in similar way. Indeed, the inequality

$$\log(x+h)\sum_{\substack{|p-x|<h\\ p=a\,[q]}}1\geq\sum_{\substack{|p-x|<h\\ p=a\,[q]}}\log p,$$

allows to prove the claim by proving that the function appearing on the right hand side of (5.1) is larger than $\log(x+h)$. This amounts to modifying (5.3) into

$$(1-F)((\alpha+1)\log x+\delta\log q+\rho)>G+\log(x+h),$$

i.e. into

$$(1-F)(\alpha\log x+\delta\log q+\rho)>G+F\log x+\log(1+h/x),$$

where F and G are defined as before (but with $\alpha+1$ instead of α in the definition of T). We simplify the inequality recalling that we are assuming that $h/x\leq 5/6$. Moreover, we once again use $\overline{G}$ instead of G in order to get an inequality which is proved for all x larger than x_0 when it is proved for x_0: by (5.6) this happens at least whenever $x\geq 23000$. Thus it is sufficient to prove that

$$(1-F)(\alpha\log x+\delta\log q+\rho)>\overline{G}+F\log x+\log(11/6). \tag{5.16}$$

Setting $x = x_0'(q) = (m'\varphi(q)\log q)^2$, for a diverging q the inequality becomes

$$2(\alpha-(\alpha+1)F)\log(m'\varphi(q)\log q)+(1-F)\delta\log q+O(1) > \Big(1.253+\frac{2}{\pi\beta}+\frac{2}{\pi\beta^2}+\frac{4\cdot 2.89}{\pi\beta T}\Big)\log q+O(1).$$

If we assume that $F \le \alpha/(\alpha+1)$, then the lower bound $\varphi(q)\log q \ge q$ shows that this is

$$(2\alpha+\delta-(2\alpha+\delta+2)F)\log q+O(1) > \Big(1.253+\frac{2}{\pi\beta}+\frac{2}{\pi\beta^2}+\frac{4\cdot 2.89}{\pi\beta T}\Big)\log q+O(1),$$

which forces us to select α, δ, l and m' in such a way that

$$2\alpha+\delta-(2\alpha+\delta+2)F \ge 1.253+\frac{2}{\pi\beta_0}+\frac{2}{\pi\beta_0^2}+\frac{4\cdot 2.89}{\pi\beta_0 T}$$

with $\beta_0 = \ell'\log m'$, $T = \frac{\beta m'}{2\alpha+\delta}$ and

$$F = \frac{1}{m'}\Big(\frac{2}{\pi}\log T+13.4+\frac{1.58}{\beta_0^2}+\Big(1+\frac{2.89}{T}\Big)\frac{1}{\pi T}\Big).$$

This implies that for the combinations of α and δ we have already considered before we have to select for ℓ' and m' the values in Table 3. As before, in order to get a statement provable for all q we have to further increase m', for which we select the values in Table 4. Now, for every choice of the parameters in Table 4 we verify by direct computation that (5.8), (5.9) (substituting α, m and ℓ with $\alpha+1$, m' and ℓ') and (5.16) are satisfied by $x = x_0'(q) := (m'\varphi(q)\log q)^2$ when $3 \le q \le q_0'$, with just a few exceptions which are in Table 6 and for which we test the claim directly for $x \in [x_0'(q), x'(q)]$. This proves this part of the theorem for $q \le q_0'$.

To deal with larger q's, we set $x = x_0'(q) = (m'\varphi(q)\log q)^2$ in (5.16), but, again, we substitute F and $\overline{G}$ with $\tilde{F}_0(q)$ and $\tilde{G}_0(q)$, getting

$$(1-\tilde{F}_0(q))(2\alpha\log(m'\varphi(q)\log q)+\delta\log q+\rho) > \tilde{G}_0(q)+2\tilde{F}_0(q)\log(m'\varphi(q)\log q)+\log(11/6).$$

Assuming

$$\tilde{F}_0(q) \le \alpha/(\alpha+1), \tag{5.17}$$

the inequality is implied by

$$(1-\tilde{F}_0(q))(2\alpha\log(m'q)+\delta\log q+\rho) \ge \tilde{G}_0(q)+2\tilde{F}_0(q)\log(m'q)+\log(11/6), \tag{5.18}$$

which is what we get substituting $\varphi(q)\log q$ with its upper bound q. We write this inequality as

$$\begin{aligned}\Big(2\alpha+\delta-(2\alpha+\delta+2)\tilde{F}_0(q)-\Big(1.253+\frac{2}{\pi\beta_0}+\frac{2}{\pi\beta_0^2}+\frac{4\cdot 2.89}{\pi\beta_0 T_-}\Big)\Big)\log q&\\ \ge\Big(1+\frac{2}{\pi\beta_0}+\frac{2}{\pi\beta_0^2}+\frac{4\cdot 2.89}{\pi\beta_0 T_-}\Big)\log\log q+(\tilde{F}_0(q)-1)(2\alpha\log m'+\rho)&\\ +\Big(1+\frac{2}{\pi\beta_0}+\frac{2}{\pi\beta_0^2}+\frac{4\cdot 2.89}{\pi\beta_0 T_-}\Big)\log\Big(\frac{\ell m'}{2\alpha}\Big)+2\tilde{F}_0(q)\log m'+2+\log(11/6),&\end{aligned}$$

i.e. as

$$\mathcal{A}\log q-\mathcal{B}\log\log q-\mathcal{C} \ge 0 \tag{5.19}$$

where $\mathcal{A}$ increases in q and $\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{C}$ decrease. It is monotonous in q when

$$\mathcal{A}'\log q-\mathcal{B}'\log\log q+\frac{\mathcal{A}}{q}-\frac{\mathcal{B}}{q\log q}-\mathcal{C}' > 0,$$

and for this it is sufficient to have

$$-\tilde{F}_0'(q)(2\alpha+\delta+2)\log q+\frac{\mathcal{A}}{q}-\frac{\mathcal{B}}{q\log q} > 0.$$

By (5.12), in order to have a monotonous behavior of (5.19) it is sufficient to have

$$\mathcal{A}\log q \ge \mathcal{B}-S(2\alpha+\delta+2). \tag{5.20}$$

In this way we see that if (5.19) holds for a certain $q = q_0'$ large enough to satisfy (5.20), then it is proved for every $q \ge q_0'$. Thus we have produced the test we were looking for: we search for the q_0'

satisfying (5.14), (5.15) (substituting α, m and ℓ with $\alpha+1$, m' and ℓ') (5.17), (5.18) and (5.20). Then everything is proved for $q \geq q_0'$. Our computations show that each q_0' appearing in Table 4 pass this test, so that also the proof of the second claim of the theorem is completed.

For $q \leq q_0'$ and $x \in [x_0'(q), x'(q)]$ we use the mighty computer procedure `CheckSqrt` described below so that now the proof of the theorem is complete.

Remark. The procedures `Check1` and `CheckSqrt` check more than what is needed: they detect the existence of prime numbers in $[x-h, x]$ except for the initial x's.

6. Proof of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3

We keep the notations

$$h = \varphi(q)(\alpha \log x + \delta \log q + \rho)\sqrt{x}, \qquad T = \frac{\beta}{\varphi(q)} \frac{\sqrt{x}}{\alpha \log x + \delta \log q + \rho},$$

but we make a different choice for β. In fact, the first two negative terms $(1+\frac{2}{\pi\beta})\log(qT)$ in (5.1), up to terms of lower order in β are

$$\log \beta + \frac{\log(q^2 x)}{\pi\beta},$$

which reaches its minimum when

$$\beta = \frac{1}{\pi} \log(q^2 x),$$

which will be how we set β. This choice puts restrictions on α and δ: to control the terms appearing in the equations below we need to have $\alpha \geq 1/2$, $\delta > 0$ and $2\alpha+\delta \geq 2$. Since we are interested in furnishing small values for α and δ, this leaves us with the range $\alpha \in [1/2, 1)$ and $\delta = 2-2\alpha$. In this range we pick the case $\alpha = 1/2$, $\delta = 1$, which is a natural choice; the interested reader will be able to complete the similar computations needed for any other setting of α and δ. Thus, our settings are:

$$h = \varphi(q)(\tfrac{1}{2}\log(q^2 x) + \rho)\sqrt{x}, \qquad T = \frac{\sqrt{x}}{\pi\varphi(q)} \frac{\log(q^2 x)}{\frac{1}{2}\log(q^2 x) + \rho}.$$

As a consequence we have

$$T \leq \frac{2}{\pi} \frac{\sqrt{x}}{\varphi(q)}, \tag{6.1}$$

$$\log(qT) \leq \frac{1}{2}\log(q^2 x) + \log\Big(\frac{2}{\pi\varphi(q)}\Big), \tag{6.2}$$

$$\frac{2\log(qT)}{\pi\beta} \leq 1. \tag{6.3}$$

Moreover,

$$-\sum_{p|q} \frac{\log p}{p-1} - \log(\varphi(q)) = -\log q - \sum_{p|q} \Big[\frac{\log p}{p-1} + \log\Big(1-\frac{1}{p}\Big)\Big] \leq -\log q. \tag{6.4}$$

The function appearing on the right hand side of (5.1) is surely positive when

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2}\log(q^2 x) + \rho \geq \log(qT) &+ \frac{2}{\pi\beta}\log(qT) + 0.253\log q + 1.53 - \sum_{p|q} \frac{\log p}{p-1} + \frac{1.638}{\varphi(q)} \\
&+ \frac{2\log(2\pi)}{\pi\beta}\Big(1-\frac{1}{\beta}\Big) + \frac{2}{\pi\beta^2}\log(qT) + \frac{4\cdot 2.89}{\pi\beta}\frac{\log(qT)}{T} \\
&+ \Big(\frac{1}{\pi}\log(q^2 T)\log T + 13.4\log q + 81.8 + \frac{84.1}{\varphi(q)}\Big)\frac{h}{x} + (1.58\log(qT) + 16.08)\frac{h}{\beta^2 x} \\
&+ 3.7 x^{-1/6} + \omega(q)\frac{\log(2x)}{\sqrt{x}} + \frac{h}{\pi x}\Big(1 + \frac{2.89}{T}\Big)\frac{\log(qT)}{T} + 1.7\frac{h}{x^{3/2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Using (6.2) for the first $\log(qT)$, (6.3) for the terms $\frac{1}{\beta}\log(qT)$, (6.1) for $\log(q^2T)\log T$, and (6.4), we deduce that it is sufficient to have

$$\begin{aligned}\rho \geq{}& \log\Big(\frac{2}{\pi}\Big)+1-0.747\log q+1.53+\frac{1.638}{\varphi(q)}+\frac{2\log(2\pi)}{\pi\beta}\Big(1-\frac{1}{\beta}\Big)+\frac{1}{\beta}\\ &+\frac{2{\cdot}2.89}{T}+\Big(\frac{1}{\pi}\log\Big(\frac{2}{\pi}\frac{q^2\sqrt{x}}{\varphi(q)}\Big)\log\Big(\frac{2}{\pi}\frac{\sqrt{x}}{\varphi(q)}\Big)+13.4\log q+81.8+\frac{84.1}{\varphi(q)}\Big)\frac{h}{x}\\ &+\Big(\frac{1.58\pi}{2}+\frac{16.08}{\beta}\Big)\frac{h}{\beta x}+\frac{3.7}{x^{1/6}}+\omega(q)\frac{\log(2x)}{\sqrt{x}}+\frac{h}{\pi x}\Big(1+\frac{2.89}{T}\Big)\frac{\log(qT)}{T}+1.7\frac{h}{x^{3/2}}.\end{aligned}$$

In several places we have assumed $T \geq 20$, thus we can use this assumption to note that it implies

$$\frac{1}{\pi}\Big(1+\frac{2.89}{T}\Big)\frac{\log(qT)}{T} \leq 0.02\log q+0.06.$$

We further assume $x \geq (8\varphi(q)\log q\log\log q)^2$, which will be needed lather anyway, to bound

$$\log\Big(\frac{2}{\pi}\Big)+2.53+\frac{1.638}{\varphi(q)}+\frac{2\log(2\pi)}{\pi\beta}\Big(1-\frac{1}{\beta}\Big)+\frac{1}{\beta}+\frac{2{\cdot}2.89}{T}+\frac{3.7}{x^{1/6}}+\omega(q)\frac{\log(2x)}{\sqrt{x}}+1.7\frac{h}{x^{3/2}} \tag{6.5}$$

with $\mathcal{E}(q)$, which is 9.3 when $q \leq 12$ and 4 otherwise. Hence it is sufficient to have

$$\begin{aligned}\rho \geq{}&\mathcal{E}(q)-0.747\log q\\ &+\Big(\frac{1}{\pi}\log\Big(\frac{2}{\pi}\frac{q^2\sqrt{x}}{\varphi(q)}\Big)\log\Big(\frac{2}{\pi}\frac{\sqrt{x}}{\varphi(q)}\Big)+13.42\log q+81.86+\frac{84.1}{\varphi(q)}\Big)\frac{h}{x}+\Big(\frac{1.58\pi}{2}+\frac{16.08}{\beta}\Big)\frac{h}{\beta x}.\end{aligned} \tag{6.6}$$

Recalling the definitions of h and β, (6.6) becomes:

$$(1-F(q,x))\rho \geq G(q,x) \tag{6.7}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}F(q,x) :={}&\Big(\frac{1}{\pi}\log\Big(\frac{2}{\pi}\frac{q^2\sqrt{x}}{\varphi(q)}\Big)\log\Big(\frac{2}{\pi}\frac{\sqrt{x}}{\varphi(q)}\Big)+13.42\log q+81.86+\frac{84.1}{\varphi(q)}\Big)\frac{\varphi(q)}{\sqrt{x}}\\ &+\Big(\frac{1.58}{2}+\frac{16.08}{\log(q^2x)}\Big)\frac{\pi^2\varphi(q)}{\log(q^2x)\sqrt{x}},\\ G(q,x) :={}&\mathcal{E}(q)+\Big(\frac{1}{\pi}\log\Big(\frac{2}{\pi}\frac{q^2\sqrt{x}}{\varphi(q)}\Big)\log\Big(\frac{2}{\pi}\frac{\sqrt{x}}{\varphi(q)}\Big)+13.42\log q\Big)\log(q\sqrt{x})\frac{\varphi(q)}{\sqrt{x}}-0.747\log q\\ &+\Big(81.86+\frac{84.1}{\varphi(q)}\Big)\log(q^2x)\frac{\varphi(q)}{2\sqrt{x}}+\Big(\frac{1.58}{2}+\frac{16.08}{\log(q^2x)}\Big)\frac{\pi^2\varphi(q)}{2\sqrt{x}}.\end{aligned}$$

We notice that $F(q,x)$ and $G(q,x)$ decrease as a function of x (hence there is no need to change G, in this case), at least for $x \geq e^6 = 403.42\ldots$. Thus, if (6.7) holds for fixed ρ and q, for a given $x_0(q)$, then it holds for any $x \geq x_0(q)$ for the same ρ and q.
Moreover we have to satisfy the assumptions

$$\frac{1}{T} = \frac{h}{\beta x} = \frac{\pi\varphi(q)}{\sqrt{x}}\Big(\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\rho}{\log(q^2x)}\Big) \leq \frac{1}{20} \tag{6.8}$$

and

$$\frac{h}{x} = \frac{\varphi(q)}{\sqrt{x}}\Big(\frac{1}{2}\log(q^2x)+\rho\Big) \leq \frac{5}{6}, \tag{6.9}$$

where again the functions appearing on the left hand side decrease in x.
We verify by direct computation that all these requirements are satisfied for $\rho = 100$ by any $x \geq x_0(q)$ with $x_0(q)$ given in Table 7, when $q \leq 5670$. For this purpose, we use a variant of Procedure `Check1`.

To deal with larger q's, we choose $x_0(q) := (m\varphi(q)\ell(q))^2$, where we set $\ell(q) := \log q \log\log q$ to simplify the notation. To select a suitable value for m we note that $G_0(q) := G(q, x_0(q))$ stays bounded if and only if

$$\frac{1}{\pi}\log\Big(\frac{q^2\sqrt{x_0(q)}}{\varphi(q)}\Big)\log\Big(\frac{\sqrt{x_0(q)}}{\varphi(q)}\Big)\log(q\sqrt{x_0(q)})\frac{\varphi(q)}{\sqrt{x_0(q)}}-0.747\log q$$

is bounded, and that this happens if and only if $\frac{4}{\pi m} < 0.747$. This shows that any m larger than 2, say, is allowed when $q \ge q_0(m)$ is large enough. With this choice of $x_0(q)$, inequalities (6.8) and (6.9) are satisfied as soon as

$$\frac{\pi}{m\ell(q)}\Big(\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\rho/2}{\log(mq\varphi(q)\ell(q))}\Big) \le \frac{1}{20}, \tag{6.10}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{m\ell(q)}\big(\log(mq\varphi(q)\ell(q))+\rho\big) \le \frac{5}{6}. \tag{6.11}$$

To deal with (6.7), (6.10) and (6.11) for arbitrary q we substitute there the arithmetical function $\varphi(q)$ with its upper bound q or its lower bound $\sqrt{q}$ in order to produce in any case upper-bounds $\tilde{F}_0(q)$ and $\tilde{G}_0(q)$ for $F_0(q) := F(q, x_0(q))$ and $G_0(q)$ respectively, and for the function to the left hand side of (6.10). In this way (6.7) changes into

$$(1-\tilde{F}_0)\rho \ge \tilde{G}_0. \tag{6.12}$$

As for Theorem 1.1, functions $\tilde{F}_0$ and those we get from (6.10) and (6.11) are decreasing in q, while this remains false for $\tilde{G}_0$. However, contrary to the situation for Theorem 1.1 the parameters α ($= \frac{1}{2}$), δ ($= 1$) and ρ ($= 100$) are now fixed, thus we can verify directly that $\rho \ge -\tilde{G}_0'/\tilde{F}_0'$ for any $q \ge 3$ and any integer $8 \le m \le 20$. This shows that for these parameters $(1-\tilde{F}_0)\rho-\tilde{G}_0$ is increasing in the full range for q.

In this way we can conclude that when $8 \le m \le 20$ all conditions we have to test become monotonous in their dependence of x and q, so that we can prove them for $x \ge x_0(q)$ and $q \ge q_0(m)$ by proving them for $x = x_0(q)$ and $q = q_0(m)$. We have collected some results in Table 8, for several values of m. Unfortunately, the computations show that any value of m smaller than 15 would produce an extremely large $q_0(m)$. As a consequence we have selected $m = 15$, as reported in Theorem 1.2. To complete the proof of Theorem 1.2 we still need to test the claim for $3 \le q < 5670$ and x in the interval $[(15\varphi(q)\ell(q))^2, x_0(q)]$ with $x_0(q)$ given in Table 7. For this purpose we use an analogue of Procedure `Check`.

For the second part of the theorem it is sufficient to prove that the right hand side of (5.1) is larger than $\log(x+h)$ when we increasing h to $h+\varphi(q)\sqrt{x}\log x$. This modifies (6.7) into

$$(1-F(q,x))\rho \ge G(q,x)+F(q,x)\log x+\log(1+5/6) =: G_s(q,x).$$

We proceed as before. In fact, both sides are decreasing as a function of x. Thus, we verify by direct computation that all these requirements are satisfied for $\rho = 100$ by any $x \ge x_0'(q)$ with $x_0'(q)$ given in Table 7, when $q \le 4200$.

Again, we choose $x_0(q) := (m'\varphi(q)\ell(q))^2$, producing

$$(1-F(q,x_0'(q)))\rho \ge G(q,x_0'(q))+F(q,x_0'(q))\log(x_0'(q))+\log(1+5/6) = G_s(q,x_0'(q)). \tag{6.13}$$

In order to have $G_s(q, x_0(q))$ bounded it is necessary that $\frac{8}{\pi m'} < 0.747$, thus any $m \ge 4$ suffices. With this choice of $x_0'(q)$, inequalities (6.8) and (6.9) are satisfied as soon as

$$\frac{\pi}{m\ell(q)}\Big(\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\rho/2+\log(m\varphi(q)\ell(q))}{\log(mq\varphi(q)\ell(q))}\Big) \le \frac{1}{20}, \tag{6.14}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{m\ell(q)}\big(\log(mq\varphi(q)\ell(q))+2\log(m\varphi(q)\ell(q))+\rho\big) \le \frac{5}{6}. \tag{6.15}$$

To deal with (6.13), (6.14) and (6.15) for arbitrary q we substitute there the arithmetical function $\varphi(q)$ with its upper bound q or its lower bound $\sqrt{q}$ in order to produce in any case upper-bounds

$\tilde{F}(q, x_0(q))$ and $\tilde{G}_s(q, x_0(q))$ for $F(q, x_0(q))$ and $G_s(q, x_0(q))$ respectively, and for the function on the left hand side of (6.14). In this way (6.13) changes into

$$(1-\tilde{F})\rho \geq \tilde{G}_s.$$

Functions $\tilde{F}$, and those we get from (6.14) and (6.15) are evidently decreasing in q, but this is still false for $\tilde{G}_s$. However, $(1-\tilde{F})\rho-\tilde{G}_s$ is decreasing if and only if $\rho \geq -\tilde{G}'_s/\tilde{F}'$ and for $\rho = 100$ this holds for any $q \geq 3$ if $m \geq 17$. In this way we can conclude that when $m \geq 17$ all conditions we have to test become monotonous in their dependence of x and q, so that we can prove them for $x \geq x'_0(q)$ and $q \geq q'_0(m')$ by proving them for $x = x'_0(q)$ and $q = q'_0(m')$. We have collected some results in Table 8, for several values of m'. Unfortunately, the computations show that any value of m' smaller than 19 would produce an extremely large $q_0(m')$. As a consequence we have selected $m = 19$, as reported in Theorem 1.2.

Lastly, it is easy to prove that $F(q, e^q)$ is smaller than 1 for $q \geq 14$ and that $G(q, e^q) \leq 0$ for $q \geq 220$, and $G_s(q, e^q) \leq 0$ for $q \geq 500$ and this proves Theorem 1.3 with $q \geq 220$ for the first claim and $q \geq 500$ for the second. The first (second) claim is extended to $q \geq 35$ ($q \geq 67$, respectively) keeping the true value of (6.5) in place of $\mathcal{E}(q)$ in the definition of $G(q, x)$.

7. Proof of Corollary 1.4

We can assume $q \geq 3$, because the claim for $q = 1$ and $q = 2$ follows from the analogous (and stronger) claim proved in [1, Cor. 4.1].
By Theorem 1.1 (case $\alpha = 1/2$, $\delta = 1$) we know that there is a prime congruent to a modulo q as soon as

$$(2n+\varphi(q)A)\varphi(q)A \geq \varphi(q)\sqrt{M}(60+\log(q^2M))$$

where $A := 30+2\log(qn)$ and $M := \frac{1}{2}[n^2+(n+\varphi(q)A)^2]$. Dividing by nA and setting $B := \frac{\varphi(q)}{n}A$, the inequality becomes

$$2+B \geq \sqrt{1+B+\frac{B^2}{2}}\Big(1+\frac{30+\log(1+B+\frac{B^2}{2})}{A}\Big),$$

i.e.,

$$\sqrt{\frac{4+4B+2B^2}{4+4B+B^2}}\Big(1+\frac{30+\log(1+B+\frac{B^2}{2})}{A}\Big) \leq 2.$$

Set $H := \sqrt{\frac{4+4B+2B^2}{4+4B+B^2}}$, and notice that it is an increasing function of B, and is bounded by $\sqrt{2}$. Hence the inequality may be written as

$$1+B+\frac{B^2}{2} \leq \exp\Big(A\Big(\frac{2}{H}-1\Big)-30\Big).$$

In terms of B this is solved by

$$B \leq \Big[2\exp\Big(A\Big(\frac{2}{H}-1\Big)-30\Big)-1\Big]^{1/2}-1,$$

but needs $2\exp(A\big(\frac{2}{H}-1\big)-30) \geq 1$. Recalling the definition of B, it means that

$$\varphi(q) \leq \frac{n}{A}\Big[\Big[2\exp\Big(A\Big(\frac{2}{H}-1\Big)-30\Big)-1\Big]^{1/2}-1\Big].$$

Recalling the definition of A, we see that for every fixed value of q, the quotient n/A increases with n. Hence $B = \varphi(q)\frac{A}{n}$ decreases with n, and $1/H$ (which decreases with B) increases with n. This shows that the function appearing on the right hand side increases as a function of n, for every fixed q, if $A(2/H-1) \geq 30$. As a consequence the inequalities hold true for $n \geq n_0$ as soon they hold for $n = n_0$. It is easy to prove that for $n \geq 70\varphi(q)\log q$ they hold for all $q \geq 3$.

8. Auxiliary tables

Table 3. Parameters for $q \to \infty$.

α	δ	m	ℓ	m'	ℓ'	α	δ	m	ℓ	m'	ℓ'
1/2	1	49	4	100	10	1.253/2	0.1	282	34	720	43
1/2	1/2	120	10	287	10	1	0	49	4	100	10
1/2	1/3	351	38	903	47	0.9	0	62	5	133	5
1.253/2	1	40	5	78	11	0.8	0	89	8	205	17
1.253/2	1/2	66	6	144	9	0.7	0	194	19	484	28
1.253/2	0.2	145	14	354	15	0.627	0	33896	2481	90027	2489

Table 4. Parameters

α	δ	ρ	m	ℓ	q_0	m'	ℓ'	q_0'
1/2	1	30	70	6	392975	130	5.3	18886967
1/2	1/2	20	180	30	329400	376	14	16723820
1/2	1/3	10	2000	50	4915200	3700	190	18022400
1.253/2	1	30	60	4	88795	110	4	246757
1.253/2	1/2	15	100	8	53259	188	7	18596847
1.253/2	0.2	10	220	35	4915200	503	32	18822400
1.253/2	0.1	10	1000	30	2048000	1800	100	19660800
1	0	20	66	6	7317779	131	5.3	11557650
0.9	0	10	100	2	55801	174	7	11963731
0.8	0	10	130	4	811397	270	9	10111465
0.7	0	5	400	14	1792000	830	20	16384000
0.627	0	10	10^{10}	3480	10^{438}	10^{10}	4100	10^{438}

TABLE 5. Exceptions: for these q's the claim has to be tested in $[x_0(q), x(q)]$

$\alpha = 1/2$, $\delta = 1$, $\rho = 30$, $m = 70$, $\ell = 6$

q	$x_0(q)$	$x(q)$	q	$x_0(q)$	$x(q)$	q	$x_0(q)$	$x(q)$
3	23656	193269	10	415668	782469	17	10069191	10885891
4	37667	210773	11	2817451	3960979	18	1473689	1856794
5	203078	627816	12	484101	827088	19	13764048	14078608
6	62923	237971	13	4642117	5843021	20	2814375	3191885
7	667950	1378402	14	1228559	1719785	21	6540288	6797266
8	339007	729308	15	2299796	2921354	22	4681726	4927119
9	851623	1495403	16	2410721	2978447	24	3167368	3372409

$\alpha = 1/2$, $\delta = 1/2$, $\rho = 20$, $m = 180$, $\ell = 30$

q	$x_0(q)$	$x(q)$	q	$x_0(q)$	$x(q)$	q	$x_0(q)$	$x(q)$
3	156420	415044	4	249066	463583	6	416068	542386

$\alpha = 1/2$, $\delta = 1/3$, $\rho = 10$, $m = 2000$, $\ell = 50$

no exceptions

$\alpha = 1.253/2$, $\delta = 1$, $\rho = 30$, $m = 60$, $\ell = 4$

q	$x_0(q)$	$x(q)$	q	$x_0(q)$	$x(q)$	q	$x_0(q)$	$x(q)$
3	17380	174459	15	1689646	2616800	27	12670067	14009303
4	27674	190024	16	1771141	2667245	28	5756099	6623899
5	149200	565474	17	7397773	9739659	29	32002293	33245723
6	46229	214145	18	1082710	1662301	30	2665300	3219701
7	490738	1239306	19	10112362	12588474	31	38206948	38724718
8	249066	655510	20	2067704	2855449	32	11069637	11796204
9	625682	1342974	21	4805110	6077148	33	17604813	18165537
10	305389	702556	22	3439635	4404968	34	11460297	12012324
11	2069964	3552436	23	17130098	19538853	36	6657089	7129459
12	355666	742016	24	2327046	3014504	38	15433843	15501433
13	3410535	5235527	25	14920072	16715757	40	12540977	12594196
14	902615	1541365	26	5502916	6479839	42	7242138	7456038

$\alpha = 1.253/2$, $\delta = 1/2$, $\rho = 15$, $m = 100$, $\ell = 8$

q	$x_0(q)$	$x(q)$	q	$x_0(q)$	$x(q)$	q	$x_0(q)$	$x(q)$
3	48277	398503	10	848303	1657810	17	20549370	21068336
4	76872	448319	11	5749901	7679461	18	3007529	3975347
5	414446	1239762	12	987961	1785626	20	5743623	6690215
6	128416	530120	13	9473709	11316247	21	13347528	13752600
7	1363163	2690697	14	2507264	3591214	22	9554543	10188087
8	691852	1509297	15	4693462	5956557	24	6464016	7195155
9	1738006	2989783	16	4919838	6108051	30	7403611	7866652

$\alpha = 1.253/2$, $\delta = 0.2$, $\rho = 10$, $m = 220$, $\ell = 35$

q	$x_0(q)$	$x(q)$	q	$x_0(q)$	$x(q)$	q	$x_0(q)$	$x(q)$
3	233665	1525649	7	6597713	9029399	12	4781734	7584457
4	372062	1847872	8	3348565	5797274	14	12135160	13995369
5	2005920	4287943	9	8411951	10563083	18	14556443	16453447
6	621533	2449912	10	4105789	6723423			

$\alpha = 1.253/2$, $\delta = 0.1$, $\rho = 10$, $m = 1000$, $\ell = 30$

no exceptions

$\alpha = 1$, $\delta = 0$, $\rho = 20$, $m = 66$, $\ell = 6$

q	$x_0(q)$	$x(q)$	q	$x_0(q)$	$x(q)$	q	$x_0(q)$	$x(q)$
3	21029	211574	16	2143081	3295786	29	38722775	40149437
4	33485	233742	17	8951305	11741219	30	3225013	4103839
5	180532	681549	18	1310079	2092803	31	46230407	46777752
6	55938	269145	19	12235958	15180563	32	13394261	14620952
7	593794	1492204	20	2501922	3566497	33	21301824	22344552
8	301370	807618	21	5814183	7477526	34	13866959	14931301
9	757075	1635314	22	4161959	5473337	35	31715721	32040583
10	369521	875340	23	20727419	23576815	36	8055078	8997876
11	2504657	4278157	24	2815725	3798932	38	18674950	19272062
12	430356	933074	25	18053287	20313173	40	15174582	15773785
13	4126748	6307104	26	6658528	8051865	42	8762987	9482578
14	1092164	1916623	27	15330781	17150551	48	16711648	16766249
15	2044472	3224114	28	6964880	8259580			

$\alpha = 0.9$, $\delta = 0$, $\rho = 10$, $m = 100$, $\ell = 2$

q	$x_0(q)$	$x(q)$	q	$x_0(q)$	$x(q)$	q	$x_0(q)$	$x(q)$
3	48277	347391	9	1738006	2630298	15	4693462	5325969
4	76872	398766	10	848303	1503797	16	4919838	5483010
5	414446	1074771	11	5749901	6668277	18	3007529	3659860
6	128416	486204	12	987961	1640888	20	5743623	6093417
7	1363163	2332196	13	9473709	9836071	24	6464016	6634327
8	691852	1348130	14	2507264	3249906			

$\alpha = 0.8$, $\delta = 0$, $\rho = 10$, $m = 130$, $\ell = 4$

q	$x_0(q)$	$x(q)$	q	$x_0(q)$	$x(q)$	q	$x_0(q)$	$x(q)$
3	81589	464029	7	2303746	3058912	12	1669655	2228857
4	129914	538253	8	1169230	1803316	14	4237276	4363247
5	700414	1415084	9	2937230	3477602			
6	217023	667205	10	1433633	2028340			

$\alpha = 0.7$, $\delta = 0$, $\rho = 5$, $m = 400$, $\ell = 14$

q	$x_0(q)$	$x(q)$	q	$x_0(q)$	$x(q)$	q	$x_0(q)$	$x(q)$
3	772447	5070855	8	11069637	18794342	18	48120473	61404373
4	1229959	7215253	9	27808104	28461476	24	103424267	105235819
5	6631143	11283576	10	13572859	24475719	30	118457790	137497186
6	2054657	12544658	12	15807388	30634494			
7	21810621	22100572	14	40116231	45870548			

TABLE 6. Exceptions: for these q's the claim has to be tested in $[x_0'(q), x'(q)]$

$\alpha = 1/2$, $\delta = 1$, $\rho = 30$, $m' = 130$, $\ell' = 5.3$

q	$x_0'(q)$	$x'(q)$	q	$x_0'(q)$	$x'(q)$	q	$x_0'(q)$	$x'(q)$
3	81589	332263	5	700414	1117509	7	2303746	2507066
4	129914	361889	6	217023	407633	8	1169230	1295310

$\alpha = 1/2$, $\delta = 1/2$, $\rho = 20$, $m' = 376$, $\ell' = 14$

q	$x_0'(q)$	$x'(q)$
3	682534	752106

$\alpha = 1/2$, $\delta = 1/3$, $\rho = 10$, $m' = 3700$, $\ell' = 190$

no exceptions

$\alpha = 1.253/2$, $\delta = 1$, $\rho = 30$, $m' = 110$, $\ell' = 4$

q	$x_0'(q)$	$x'(q)$	q	$x_0'(q)$	$x'(q)$	q	$x_0'(q)$	$x'(q)$
3	58416	300370	6	155383	367379	9	2102987	2432469
4	93015	326746	7	1649428	2247503	10	1026447	1244731
5	501480	1005397	8	837141	1162936	12	1195433	1313466

$\alpha = 1.253/2$, $\delta = 1/2$, $\rho = 15$, $m' = 188$, $\ell' = 7$

q	$x_0'(q)$	$x'(q)$	q	$x_0'(q)$	$x'(q)$	q	$x_0'(q)$	$x'(q)$
3	170633	912089	6	453873	1204678	9	6142810	7269512
4	271698	1023615	7	4817966	6556245	10	2998244	3921253
5	1464819	2951611	8	2445282	3579313	12	3491852	4216725

$\alpha = 1.253/2$, $\delta = 0.2$, $\rho = 10$, $m' = 503$, $\ell' = 32$

q	$x_0'(q)$	$x'(q)$	q	$x_0'(q)$	$x'(q)$
3	1221475	4037185	5	10485868	11987232
4	1944942	4847916	6	3249042	6326873

$\alpha = 1.253/2$, $\delta = 0.1$, $\rho = 10$, $m' = 1000$, $\ell' = 30$

no exceptions

$\alpha = 1$, $\delta = 0$, $\rho = 20$, $m' = 131$, $\ell' = 5.3$

q	$x_0'(q)$	$x'(q)$	q	$x_0'(q)$	$x'(q)$	q	$x_0'(q)$	$x'(q)$
3	82849	401948	6	220374	513295	9	2982592	3281292
4	131920	444916	7	2339325	2989582	10	1455773	1725548
5	711231	1338243	8	1187287	1590532	12	1695441	1841299

$\alpha = 0.9$, $\delta = 0$, $\rho = 10$, $m' = 174$, $\ell' = 7$

q	$x_0'(q)$	$x'(q)$	q	$x_0'(q)$	$x'(q)$	q	$x_0'(q)$	$x'(q)$
3	146166	1114575	10	2568324	4916663	17	62215274	62466648
4	232739	1278677	11	17408402	22447061	18	9105596	12097079
5	1254778	3523996	12	2991153	5361721	20	17389394	20311457
6	388792	1555739	13	28682604	33263239	21	40410976	41435388
7	4127114	7741184	14	7590993	10753449	22	28927335	30914889
8	2094652	4414495	15	14209928	17776793	24	19570457	22094486
9	5261988	8723154	16	14895304	18304301	30	22415175	24501112

$\alpha = 0.8$, $\delta = 0$, $\rho = 10$, $m' = 270$, $\ell' = 9$

q	$x_0'(q)$	$x'(q)$	q	$x_0'(q)$	$x'(q)$	q	$x_0'(q)$	$x'(q)$
3	351946	1492408	6	936153	2153115	10	6184133	6748660
4	560400	1734713	7	9937464	10330820	12	7202241	7422780
5	3021314	4694415	8	5043603	5998433			

$\alpha = 0.7$, $\delta = 0$, $\rho = 5$, $m' = 830$, $\ell' = 20$

q	$x_0'(q)$	$x'(q)$	q	$x_0'(q)$	$x'(q)$	q	$x_0'(q)$	$x'(q)$
3	3325868	18778046	8	47661707	72194674	18	207188714	235724502
4	5295745	26208496	10	58439641	92606804	30	510034825	528007383
5	28551216	44359843	12	68060686	114431222			
6	8846583	43904349	14	172725450	178876777			

TABLE 7. Constants for the proof of Theorem 1.2: small q's.

q	x_0	q	x_0	q	x_0'	q	x_0'
3	743717	9	4420599	3	921530	9	5631960
4	700559	10	2068557	4	867525	10	2605682
5	2343430	11	10928153	5	2956605	11	14110404
6	645916	12	2004486	6	799147	12	2523895
7	4614984	$13 \le q \le 100$	$(134\varphi(q)\ell(q))^2$	7	5883045	$13 \le q \le 100$	$(152\varphi(q)\ell(q))^2$
8	2151374	$100 \le q \le 5670$	$(37\varphi(q)\ell(q))^2$	8	2711406	$100 \le q \le 4200$	$(43\varphi(q)\ell(q))^2$

TABLE 8. Constants for the proof of Theorem 1.2: large q's.

m	q_0	m'	q_0'
8	3499716160977515659	14	21269072
9	41350334411	15	970700
10	72969656	16	142565
11	2206128	17	37239
12	240344	18	13590
13	51304	19	4200
14	16241	20	2310
15	5670	21	1398

Input: Three reals α, δ, ρ
Input: Two integers q, x
return $(\alpha \log x + \delta \log q + \rho)\varphi(q)\sqrt{x}$;

Function h1(α, δ, ρ, q, x)

Input: Three reals α, δ, ρ
Input: Three integers q, x_0, x
for $a \leftarrow 1$ **to** $q-1$ **do**
  if $(a,q) \neq 1$ **then continue** $M_1[a] \leftarrow x_0 + \texttt{h1}(\alpha, \delta, \rho, q, x_0)$;
end
forprime $p \leftarrow x_0$ **to** $x + \texttt{h1}(\alpha, \delta, \rho, q, x)$ **do**
  $a \leftarrow p \mod q$;
  if $(a,q) \neq 1$ **then continue if** $M_1[a] \leq p$ **then**
    `print` ("Problem with class ", a, " mod ", q, " for $x =$", $M_1[a]$);
  end
  $M_1[a] \leftarrow p + \texttt{h1}(\alpha, \delta, \rho, q, p)$;
endfp
for $a \leftarrow 1$ **to** $q-1$ **do**
  if $(a,q) \neq 1$ **then continue if** $M_1[a] < x$ **then**
    `print` ("Problem with class ", a, " mod ", q, " for $x =$", $M_1[a]$);
  end
end

Procedure Check1(α, δ, ρ, q, x_0, x)

Input: Three reals α, δ, ρ
Input: Two integers q, x
return $((\alpha+1)\log x+\delta\log q+\rho)\varphi(q)\sqrt{x}$;

Function hsqrt(α, δ, ρ, q, x)

Input: Three reals α, δ, ρ
Input: Three integers q, x_0, x
for $a \leftarrow 1$ **to** $q-1$ **do**
  if $(a,q) \neq 1$ **then continue** $M_s[a] \leftarrow x_0'+$`hsqrt`$(\alpha,\delta,\rho,q,x_0')$;
  $N[a] \leftarrow$ `floor`$(M_s[a])+1$;
end
forprime $p \leftarrow x_0'$ **to** $x'+$`hsqrt`$(\alpha,\delta,\rho,q,x')$ **do**
  $a \leftarrow p \mod q$;
  if $(a,q) \neq 1$ **then continue** $N[a] \leftarrow N[a]-1$;
  if $N[a] \neq 0$ **then continue if** $M_s[a] \leq p$ **then**
    `print` ("Problem for sqrt claim with class ", a, " mod ", q, " for $x =$", $M_s[a]$);
  end
  $M_s[a] \leftarrow p+$`hsqrt`(α,δ,ρ,q,p);
  $N[a] \leftarrow$ `floor`$(M_s[a])+1$;
endfp
for $a \leftarrow 1$ **to** $q-1$ **do**
  if $(a,q) \neq 1$ **then continue if** $M_s[a] < x'$ **then**
    `print` ("Problem for sqrt claim with class ", a, " mod ", q, " for $x =$", $M_s[a]$);
  end
end

Procedure CheckSqrt(α, δ, ρ, q, x_0', x')

Acknowledgements. All computations have been done using PARI/GP [10].

References

[1] A. Dudek, L. Grenié, and G. Molteni, *Primes in explicit short intervals on RH*, Int. J. Number Theory **12** (2016), no. 5, 1391–1407, DOI: `http://dx.doi.org/10.1142/S1793042116500858`.

[2] P. Dusart, *Autour de la fonction qui compte le nombre de nombres premiers*, Ph.D. thesis, Université de Limoges, 1998, `http://www.unilim.fr/laco/theses/1998/T1998_01.html`.

[3] L. Grenié and G. Molteni, *Explicit smoothed prime ideals theorems under GRH*, Math. Comp. **85** (2016), no. 300, 1875–1899, electronically published on October 6, 2015, DOI: `http://dx.doi.org/10.1090/mcom3039`.

[4] L. Grenié and G. Molteni, *Explicit versions of the prime ideal theorem for Dedekind zeta functions under GRH*, Math. Comp. **85** (2016), no. 298, 889–906, electronically published on October 7, 2015, DOI: `http://dx.doi.org/10.1090/mcom3031`.

[5] L. Grenié, G. Molteni, and Perelli A., *Primes and prime ideals in short intervals*, preprint arXiv:1602.02906, `http://arxiv.org/abs/1602.02906`, 2016.

[6] H. Kadiri, *Short effective intervals containing primes in arithmetic progressions and the seven cubes problem*, Math. Comp. **77** (2008), no. 263, 1733–1748.

[7] Y. Lamzouri, X. Li, and K. Soundararajan, *Conditional bounds for the least quadratic non-residue and related problems*, Math. Comp. **84** (2015), no. 295, 2391–2412.

[8] K. S. McCurley, *Explicit estimates for the error term in the prime number theorem for arithmetic progressions*, Math. Comp. **42** (1984), no. 165, 265–285.

[9] H. L. Montgomery and R. C. Vaughan, *The large sieve*, Mathematika **20** (1973), 119–134.

[10] The PARI Group, Bordeaux, *PARI/GP, version* `2.6.0`, 2013, from `http://pari.math.u-bordeaux.fr/`.

[11] D. J. Platt and T. S. Trudgian, *On the first sign change of* $\theta(x)-x$, Math. Comp. **85** (2016), no. 299, 1539–1547, electronically published on Augusty 21, 2015, DOI: `http://dx.doi.org/10.1090/mcom/3021`.

[12] J. B. Rosser and L. Schoenfeld, *Sharper bounds for the Chebyshev functions* $\theta(x)$ *and* $\psi(x)$, Math. Comp. **29** (1975), 243–269.

[13] T. S. Trudgian, *An improved upper bound for the error in the zero-counting formulae for Dirichlet L-functions and Dedekind zeta-functions*, Math. Comp. **84** (2015), no. 293, 1439–1450.

[14] L. C. Washington, *Introduction to cyclotomic fields*, second ed., Springer-Verlag, New York, 1997.

(A. Dudek) Mathematical Sciences Institute, The Australian National University
E-mail address: adrian.dudek@anu.edu.au

(L. Grenié) Dipartimento di Ingegneria gestionale, dell'informazione e della produzione, Università di Bergamo, viale Marconi 5, 24044 Dalmine (BG) Italy
E-mail address: loic.grenie@gmail.com

(G. Molteni) Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Milano, via Saldini 50, 20133 Milano, Italy
E-mail address: giuseppe.molteni1@unimi.it